

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 306 747

EC 212 811

AUTHOR Bunish, Norbert T.
TITLE A Model Mainstreaming Program for the Elementary School.
PUB DATE Jun 85
NOTE 263p.; Master's Thesis, DePaul University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042) -- Reports
- Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Content Validity;
*Disabilities; *Educational Principles; Elementary
Education; *Mainstreaming; Models; *Program
Development; *Program Effectiveness; Rating Scales;
Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This study surveyed educators involved in mainstreaming students with disabilities into regular elementary classrooms, to determine their perceptions of the necessary characteristics of a successful mainstreaming program. Their responses were used to formulate a model for a mainstreaming program. The study began with a review of the literature and development of a survey questionnaire. To validate the content of the survey questionnaire, 33 special educators rated certain characteristics as to their importance to a successful mainstream program. After modifications to the questionnaire, 25 special educators completed it. Factors rated important on the questionnaire were grouped into the following categories: student orientation time, teacher orientation time, ancillary personnel factors, administrative factors, parent/community relations factors, curriculum factors, teacher orientation/in-service factors, educational environment factors, communication factors, student orientation factors, and student assessment factors. Eleven administrators then indicated the degree to which they felt that the grouped factors were capable of being accomplished. All but two of these model components were felt to be feasible by the administrators. Data is displayed in 111 tables. (JDD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED306747

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

A MODEL
MAINSTREAMING PROGRAM
FOR THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Graduate School
Department of Human Services and Counseling

DePaul University

In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

by

Norbert T. Bunish

June 1985

DePaul University

Chicago, Illinois

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Norbert T.
Bunish

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EC212811

ABSTRACT

A MODEL MAINSTREAMING PROGRAM FOR THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

BUNISH, Norbert T. M.A., 1985. DePaul University. 255pp.

Supervisor: William E. Gorman, Ed.D.

The purpose of this study was to survey educators involved in mainstreaming handicapped students into the regular classroom as to what they perceived as the necessary qualities or characteristics of a successful mainstreaming program and incorporate them into a model mainstreaming program for the elementary school.

Data were gathered via questionnaires which were devised by the investigator. The items reflected the most highly valued characteristics of mainstreaming programs which were suggested by the literature. Following review and revision by a panel of experts, the instrument was sent to the educators to establish content validity.

The revised questionnaire was sent to the educators to determine which factors would be included in the final version of the model. A feasibility study was conducted with local level administrators being asked to judge the feasibility of the sections of the model in general, and specifically for their school.

A total response rate of 72.6% indicated the topic of the study was considered to be both vital and germane to the interests of the respondents.

Educators involved in mainstreaming may find the factors included in the model useful for more effective program planning. The results could have implications for inservice training, teacher education programs, and other related areas that would help insure successful mainstreaming programs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to Dr. William E. Gorman, chairman of my thesis committee, for his invaluable assistance and confidence in this undertaking. A debt of gratitude is also owed to the members of our committee, Dr. John R. Taccarino and Sister Frances Ryan.

I am deeply indebted to the educators of the Elementary School Districts of Cook County, Illinois, outside the City of Chicago, for their cooperation and help in this study.

My greatest appreciation goes to my wife Mary Jo, and my daughter Lisa Marie, for their love, support, patience, and understanding, without which I could never have completed this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Hypothesis	6
Variables	6
Assumptions	6
Source of Data	7
Delimitation of the Study	8
Definition of Terms	9
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	12
Attitudes	19
Teacher Attitudes	19
Peer Attitudes	22
Parent Involvement	31
Communication	33
Administration	35
Staff Development	39
Instruction - Preparatory Skills Training .	46
Peer Interaction Facilitation	47
Peer Teaching	47
Curricular Adaptations	48

Instructional Management	50
Special Delivery	52
Summary	59
III. METHODOLOGY	63
Introduction	63
The Sample	63
The Questionnaires	64
Analysis of Data	65
Questionnaire One - Establishing	
Content Validity	67
Questionnaire Two - Selection of	
Factors for the Model	121
Feasibility Study Item Analysis	169
IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS	181
Introduction	181
Summary of Findings - Section One	
of the Questionnaires and	
Feasibility Study	181
Model Mainstreaming Program for the	
Elementary School	185
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	192
Summary	192
Conclusions	194
Recommendations for Further Research	195
REFERENCES	198

APPENDICES

A. Cover Letter for Questionnaires One & Two, Follow-Up Letter for Questionnaire One	218
B. Questionnaire One	221
C. Questionnaire Two	228
D. Feasibility Study Cover Letter	234
E. Feasibility Study Questionnaire	236
F. Responses to Section Two of Questionnaires One & Two	240
G. Comments to Sections of the Feasibility Study	244
H. Summary of Means and Standard Deviations Questionnaire One	249
I. Summary of Means and Standard Deviations Questionnaire Two	251
J. Summary of Means and Standard Deviations Feasibility Study	253
VITA AUCTORIS	255

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since the enactment of Public Law 94-142 in November, 1975, and its full implementation in September, 1978; all the states have been mandated to establish procedures to insure handicapped children receive an appropriate education. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142) is the culmination of litigation and legislation that has occurred on behalf of exceptional children over the past several decades, although it had its origin in the hearts and beliefs of a small number of late nineteenth and early twentieth century special education pioneers (Reynolds, 1974).

Public Law 94-142 reaffirms the right of every child to a free public education. The law mandates the education of handicapped and nonhandicapped children together unless the nature and severity of the handicap is such that education in the regular classroom cannot be achieved satisfactorily (Children's Defense Fund, 1976). Generally this means that handicapped children must have available to them the variety of educational programs and services available to the nonhandicapped students. All children

must be educated in the "least restrictive environment." The popular term for this provision is "mainstreaming" (Hayes & Higgins, 1978).

Many people have incorrectly defined mainstreaming as placing all handicapped children into regular classrooms. Mainstreaming can only apply to those handicapped students who can be educated in the regular classroom or portion of the regular school program.

The basic idea in mainstreaming is to bring the handicapped out of their isolation and segregation into the mainstream of life. A more accurate way of referring to the intent of mainstreaming is to think of "least restrictive environments" (Pasternak, 1979). It is expected that many handicapped children can be moved from segregated settings into less isolated, less restrictive, settings where they can interact more positively and frequently with their nonhandicapped peers.

The idea of least restrictive environment, with the accompanying attention to normalization in the lives of the handicapped, has far-reaching implications for special educators as well as regular classroom teachers. Special education teachers find their roles shifting to one of serving as a resource for those involved in mainstreamed settings. Regular classroom teachers will be faced with new and different responsibilities that may require skills not generally practiced in the classroom (Tice, 1970).

Although regular teachers may have had some training in the education of the handicapped, many have not had any previous experience working with exceptional children. As a result, many teachers resist mainstreaming; not necessarily because they dislike the handicapped, but because they feel ill-prepared to work with students who require extra and special attention (Flynn, Jacka, & Sundean, 1977).

The ideal of least restrictive environment is conceptually sound, but under the mandate of PL 94-142 implementation and interpretation of the intent is often misconstrued. Public school administrators and teachers are often confused and frustrated as they try to implement a law they don't totally understand. Special educators are often equally frustrated as their roles shift and they are unclear as to exactly what is expected from them. It must be understood that mainstreaming is "a complicated business, in practice. Mainstreaming depends largely on judgement calls, with little specific guidance from the law" (Lazarus, 1980, p.8).

Owing to the lack of guidelines for successfully implementing PL 94-142, many local education agencies are forcing mainstreaming on their constituents. Mainstreaming is a reality and guidelines are needed so it can be seen as a benefit to the entire educational community and not as a necessary but unwelcome burden.

Statement of Problem

Exceptional children who have the skills to work in the mainstream deserve the opportunity to receive the most appropriate program in the regular classroom. Although the premise behind this statement seems relatively simple, it actually implies a complex network of training and preparation before it can be successfully achieved (Reynolds, 1974). Because of the relative newness of the mainstreaming concept, little attention has been given to the organizational, administrative, and educational constructs that would enable mainstreaming to be effective (Pasternak, 1979).

Although all school districts have been mandated to implement PL94-142 since 1978, it can be safely assumed many attempts have met with resistance, frustration, and failure. It would be extremely valuable to gather data from individuals who have been involved with mainstreaming as to what they perceive is necessary in order for it to be successful. Once compiled, the information could be used as a guideline for others who want to convert their mainstreaming program from an ineffective one to one which is truly successful in meeting the challenge and to provide quality education for all children.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to survey educators involved in mainstreaming handicapped children into the regular classroom as to what they perceived as the necessary qualities or characteristics of a successful mainstreaming program. Their responses would then be used to formulate a model for a successful mainstreaming program. Although the law is specific regarding the guidelines for implementation, it does not clearly speak to the organizational, administrative, and instructional processes involved in that implementation. Hopefully, the information which has been collected from those who have had previous experience with mainstreaming will provide a source for others to use as a guide for more successfully responding to their own programmatic situations.

The resulting model will:

1. Provide educators with guidelines for implementing PL 94-142.
2. Provide additional data upon which to make future inservice decisions.
3. Provide guidelines for necessary organizational and role shifts to better suit educating handicapped children in mainstreaming situations.

4. Provide information for both regular and special educators so that they might better understand the role group perspectives of others in order to work together more successfully.

Hypothesis

Interested parties in Cook County Illinois Elementary School Districts, outside the City of Chicago, will be able to determine the factors needed for a successful elementary school mainstreaming program.

Variables

Independent Variable. The model mainstreaming program for the elementary school.

Descriptive Variable. The statements concerning the factors of a successful elementary school mainstreaming program.

Mediating Variable. The varying environments from which the sample was drawn.

Assumptions

1. Handicapped children have unique physical, mental, emotional, and social characteristics.
2. All public schools in Cook County, Illinois are responding to PL 94-142.
3. Local school administrators have constraints placed upon them by boards of education and district level

administrators.

4. School districts will vary significantly in regards to financing, availability of support personnel, and the level of educational expertise within the district.
5. A clear understanding by all educators of the purposes and goals of mainstreaming and successful implementation processes are necessary before effective implementation can begin.
6. If individuals in different role groups are aware of how perceptions of others might differ from their own regarding the organization, administration, and instructional characteristics of mainstreaming; planning and implementing PL 94-142 will be more effective.
7. Managed change is essential in helping organizations to effectively adapt to a changing environment.
8. The factors which were identified for the model may not be the only variables which impact mainstreaming success.

Source of Data

Data for the study came from a review of the literature and a survey of special education and regular education personnel involved in mainstreaming. The survey dealt with their perceptions of the factors needed for a successful mainstreaming program.

Delimitation of Study

The sample of special and regular educators included in this study was of a limited nature. It was obtained from educators in elementary school districts located in Cook County, Illinois, outside the City of Chicago.

Definition of Terms

Exceptional/handicapped students refers to those students evaluated by competent professionals (following state guidelines) and designated as mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, deaf-blind, multihandicapped, or having a specific learning disability.

Regular education refers to the educational program generally offered by the local school district to the majority of its students.

Regular classroom teacher refers to an individual who works within public or private educational organizations and whose primary responsibility and training does not include teaching handicapped students.

Special education refers to educational services and practices applied to exceptional students.

Special education teacher refers to an individual whose primary responsibility is providing educational services and practices applied to exceptional students.

Mainstreaming refers to the placing of identified handicapped students into educational settings with nonhandicapped students.

Least restrictive environment refers to an

integrated educational setting, as close to the regular classroom as appropriate, in which handicapped students are educated with students who are not handicapped. (This does not necessarily mean the regular classroom.)

Diagnostic team refers to a group of professional educators, and where appropriate, other professionals qualified to administer and determine the results of certain technical (clinical) tests which are designed to assess a student's strengths and weaknesses in specific areas of learning.

Staffing refers to the meeting of all educational personnel, and other professionals, involved in the evaluation of a handicapped student; the parents of the student; and, if appropriate, the student to make recommendations relative to the individualized program most appropriate to meet the student's learning needs.

Individualized education program (IEP) refers to a written statement of the objectives, content, implementation, and evaluation of a handicapped student's educational program.

Ancillary/support personnel refers to school employees who are licensed or certified in the professional areas of medicine, psychology, social work, counseling, occupational therapy, physical

therapy or other areas and whose responsibility it is to participate in diagnoses, staffings, development of individualized educational programs and/or follow-up of handicapped students' progress.

Inservice program refers to the training given to teachers who are already in school positions.

Behavior modification refers to the technique of changing or controlling the way a person behaves by controlling the events which come after the behavior.

Due process refers to the set of legal requirements which guarantee that the rights of the handicapped child, the child's parents, and the school district are protected.

Panel of experts refers to a group of five individuals who were deemed by the author to have informed insights into mainstreaming practice and research by nature of their training and professional positions. They reviewed and critiqued the questionnaire items prior to the dissemination of the questionnaire to the respondents.

Resource room refers to any setting in the school to which a child comes to receive specific instruction on a regularly scheduled basis, while receiving the major part of his/her education elsewhere.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The problem of educating children is not new. However the education of exceptional children is of relatively recent origin. Historically, social treatment of the handicapped has generally preceded educational practices and mirror society's perception and sensitivity toward these individuals. Society's view of exceptionality has undergone a tremendous change. The concepts of ridicule and superstition have been replaced by education and rehabilitation.

Deviant individuals were often relegated to attics or back wards of hospitals, often others were tolerated as the village idiot. However, due to the leadership of a few enlightened individuals (e.g., Horace Mann, Dorothea Dix, Sam Gridley Howe), residential schools were established which stressed training as well as protective environment. By the early and mid 1900's the public school movement was taking hold and provisions were being made to accomodate children exhibiting varying degrees of exceptionalities.

Large cities led the way in providing educational opportunities for the handicapped. In 1896 Chicago opened its first day school for the deaf and institutional classes for the maladjusted. In 1899, the Board of Education of the City of Chicago pioneered the first

Department of Child Study in the country. By 1902, Chicago, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Los Angeles had established special education classes for children with disabilities.

Various court decisions (Beattie v. Wisconsin State Board of Education, 1919; Committee v. Johnson, Boston, 1941), upheld the power of school boards to exclude disabled children from regular schools and force them into special schools. New York and Washington D.C. had sections in their education codes giving the schools the power to exclude children with severe disabilities from regular school activities.

As years progressed and education became a right and not a privilege, the philosophy of "education for all" modified and strengthened the concept of public education. Every child was thought to have the right to an opportunity to grow, develop, and learn to the fullest measure of his capacity - be that great or small (Haring, 1974). While no single element can account for society's change of attitude, concerned individuals and active parent and professional organizations have benefited the process (Gargiulo, 1980).

Since the early 1970's, countless class action

suits have been brought to courts on behalf of exceptional children. The "right to education" cases are partially based on Brown v. Board of Education (1954). The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the state must provide equal educational opportunities for all children. Although primarily an integration imperative, "Brown" has provided the legal foundation for landmark decisions involving exceptional children.

Dunn, a leader in special education, was the first major educator to publicly question the efficacy of separating handicapped children from normal children in schools and one of the early advocates of mainstreaming. He argued that special education teachers had been given children the regular teachers could not reach, and frequently these students were minority children from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. He maintained:

We have been living at the mercy of general educators who have referred their problem children to special education, and generally special education has been ill-prepared and ineffective in educating these children. (Dunn, 1968, p.5).

The class action suit of Diana v. California State Board of Education (1970) dealt with the allegation that Mexican-American students were being discriminated

against by improper use of psychological tests used as the primary criterion for special placement in classes for the mentally retarded. The number of minority group enrollments in special classes was found to be disproportionate in relation to the group's total enrollment. The outcome of the "Diana" case included a stipulation in the California Code that any ethnic, socio-economic, and cultural group not be considered for placement in classes for the mentally retarded if they could be appropriately placed in the regular classroom.

In 1971 the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children won a consent decree in the Pennsylvania Supreme Court which required the public schools in the state to provide "free and appropriate education for all handicapped children from the ages of 4 to 21. That same year Mills v. Board of Education for the District of Columbia expanded the "right to education" to include children with special needs, not just retarded children.

As a result of the Wyatt Case, tried in 1972 in the District Court of Alabama, school districts were required to show why retarded individuals would not benefit from a less restrictive environment before

placing them in a segregated learning environment. That same year the ruling in the Parisi Case, heard in a U.S. District Court of New York, mandated the state to provide less restrictive alternatives for the handicapped.

The United States Congress passed the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-112) which requires all recipients of H.E.W. funds which operate public elementary or secondary education programs to provide a free appropriate public education to each qualified handicapped person who is in the recipient's jurisdiction, regardless of the nature or severity of the person's handicap.

In Illinois, the Mandatory Special Education Act of 1965 (H.B. 1407), is part of Article 14 of the Illinois School Code. It went into effect July 1, 1969 and provides for special education services for all handicapped students 3 to 21 years of age. Article 14 also contains provisions for tuition payments for children too severely handicapped for public school special education programs.

Legislation for handicapped children reached its high water mark with the enactment of P.L. 94-142. The expressed purpose of this law is to assure that all handicapped children have available to them ... a free,

appropriate public education which emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs, to assure that the rights of handicapped children and their parents are protected(PL 94-142,1975).

Highlights of PL 94-142 include: An individualized education program (IEP) for every special education child; the child to receive an education, to the maximum extent possible, in the least restrictive environment; state and local educational agencies must seek out those students not receiving an appropriate education, and upgrade the education of those special education students currently being inadequately served; state and local educational agencies have the financial responsibility of providing services to the special education student with the federal government providing aid but limiting the number of children for who aid can be received to 12% of the total school age population; states must submit detailed plans outlining their policies and procedures for guaranteeing a free appropriate public education for all handicapped children and provide for comprehensive personnel development including inservice training; due process guarantees are extended to the child and parents (guardians) with respect to identification, evaluation, and placement procedures;

the act also includes sections dealing with employment of handicapped citizens, removal of architectural barriers and establishment of educational media and material centers.

Mainstreaming can be defined as the provision of an appropriate educational opportunity for all handicapped students in the least restrictive alternative, based on the IEP, with procedural safeguards and parent involvement, and aimed at providing students with access to and constructive interaction with nonhandicapped peers (Johnson & Johnson, 1980).

As schools comply with the provisions of PL 94-142, regular classroom teachers are expected to integrate handicapped students into the mainstream of nonhandicapped classroom life and peer friendship networks. Placing handicapped students into regular classrooms is a beginning of an opportunity, but it carries with it the risk of making things worse as well as the possibility of making things better. If the integration goes badly, handicapped students will be more severely and directly stigmatized, stereotyped and rejected. If things go well, true friendships and constructive relationships may develop between nonhandicapped and handicapped students and adults.

Attitudes

Positive attitudes toward handicapped students in mainstreamed settings is important to the success of these special learners. Schmelkin (1981) maintains that the climate within which mainstreaming is to be implemented is probably one of the most important determiners of the outcome.

Leckie (1979) also feels that the process of mainstreaming handicapped students necessitates the provision of a climate exemplified by a positive attitude exhibited by regular teachers and administrators and the provision of adequate resource services.

Teacher Attitudes

It appears that teachers need to feel successful in their dealings with handicapped students to feel positively about them. Schubert and Glick (1981) investigated various school districts in Ohio which had successful mainstreaming programs in order to determine which variables appeared to make them successful. They identified five significant factors which were found in all successful schools. These elements were good communication, strong administrative support of the program, flexibility in scheduling, positive attitudes of professionals involved, and the

passage of time which permitted program participants to settle into the idea that mainstreaming was a regular part of the school's operations. The variable of positive attitudes was found to have impacted the other four areas.

Teachers and teacher attitudes are particularly important as they usually are the major available agents for the children who are integrated. Teachers often feel inadequate to meet diverse needs of students in their classrooms. In one survey, (Kelly, Bullock, & Dykes, 1977) teachers identified 20.4% of their students as needing additional help they felt they were unable to provide. This would indicate a serious need to rethink the content of preservice and inservice teacher education programs in order to help teachers feel better prepared to assist children perceived as having learning or behavior disorders.

The particular attitudes teachers hold toward children tend to affect the way they behave toward them. Good and Brophy (1972) showed that teachers interacted differently with students toward whom they felt attachment, indifference, or concern.

One of the characteristics of negative attitudes is represented by the stereotypes teachers have toward

children who are catagorically labled (i.e., mentally retarded, learning disabled, emotionally disturbed, etc.). Often teachers hold beliefs about how a child will behave solely on preconceived notions about the disability group of which the child is a member. When this happens one might find the behaviors that do exist in a child may be the result of expectations determined by the label (Algozzine, Mercer, & Counterline, 1977). Labels should be used with caution as some may carry negative connotations which foster elements of children's behavior which makes them exceptional (Combs & Harper, 1967).

Foster and Keech (1977) point out in their study the extent to which expectancies of regular classroom teachers are influenced by labels and the extent to which these expectancies, once established, are maintained in the face of conflicting evidence. Foster and Salvia (1977) went so far as to say that when teachers are asked to rate a labeled child, they are quite willing to rate in the absence of observable behaviors.

It would seem likely that the more experience a teacher has working with exceptional children the less their expectations would be influenced by labels. However, the research tends to support the concept that

there is little difference between special education teachers and regular classroom teachers in their tendency to be influenced by labeling. Gillung and Rucker (1977) found both regular classroom teachers and special education teachers have lower expectations and perceive the problems as more severe and requiring more care for children with labels than for children who were not labeled.

Peer Attitudes

The rationale for integrating handicapped children into the regular classroom is based on the premise that they will benefit socially and academically from such placement. The idea that regular class placement is mutually beneficial to the nonhandicapped child as well as to the handicapped child has been, and still is, a highly debated issue.

The phenomena of labels influencing attitude also reaches the nonhandicapped peers of exceptional children. The underlying concept behind integration is that contact will mitigate negative stereotypical attitudes. However, the opposite is found. Labeling still produced more negative attitudes from nonhandicapped peers regardless of the amount of contact (Cook & Wollersheim, 1976). Attitudes of nonhandicapped high school students were

studied by Jones and Gottfried (1966) who found nonhandicapped students placed a greater social distance between themselves and the handicapped. The more severely retarded were consistently ranked least desirable for social contact.

The literature dealing with regular class integration focuses primarily on the mentally retarded student as these students have historically been integrated more than those with other types of handicaps.

Litton, Banbury, and Harris (1980) reviewed studies dealing with other types of handicaps. They found that unfavorable attitudes and feelings toward handicapped students by their peers and adults need not exist. They cited studies by Larson dealing with the emotionally disturbed and learning disabled; those by Kaufman, Semmel and Agard dealing with the educable mentally retarded; Lazar, Sippel, and D'Alonza's study dealing with the trainable mentally handicapped; McCarthy and Stodden's work with the physically handicapped; Almond, Rogers and King's work with the autistic; Northcott's study of the hearing impaired; and at all levels of education from Raver's study involving preschool students to Orlansky's study of college students. All the studies showed it is possible to change attitudes about handicaps

from negative to positive.

Preparation of the handicapped child prior to mainstreaming is equally important. Those handicapped youngsters who received training in interpersonal functioning with peers were able to achieve a greater measure of success in the regular classroom (LaGreca & Mesibov, 1981).

Greater success in the classroom doesn't necessarily mean total social acceptance. Nonhandicapped students were more positive about having handicapped students in their school and classes than they were in having them for work partners, friends, or romantic interests. The closer the relationship was, the less likelihood of there being an enthusiastic acceptance. The handicap most upsetting to regular students is blindness, followed by limited use of hands and arms, and wheel chair confinement (Woodward, 1980).

Whether physical proximity results in increased rejection or acceptance of handicapped students by their peers depends on how the situation is structured. Within any classroom a teacher can structure positive goal interdependence (cooperation), negative goal interdependence (competition), or no interdependence (individualistic learning). In a cooperative learning situation, students

can achieve their learning if, and only if, the other students with whom they are cooperatively linked achieve their learning goal. In a competitive learning situation students attain their goals only if the other students fail to attain theirs. In the individualistic learning situation, the goal achievement of each student is unrelated to that of the others. Each student's success is contingent on his own performance regardless of the performance of others.

Each goal structure promotes a different pattern of interaction among students. Competition allows nonhandicapped students to keep their negative views of handicapped students while individualistic efforts allows them to ignore and/or avoid the handicapped students. Cooperative experiences, as a result of working in relatively small heterogeneous groups in which all members must master the assigned material, allow realistic, differentiated, and dynamic views of each other to develop. The nature of the handicap and its boundaries become more and more clear, along with the wide variety of personal characteristics the handicapped student possesses. A positive cathexis in which the positive value attached to another person's efforts to help one achieve one's goals become generalized to that

person (Deutch, 1962).

Chenault (1967) suggests that a specially organized cooperative activity (such as a dramatic skit) can also enhance the handicapped student's peer and self esteem. Some of the factors which might be involved are: (a) cooperative group effort, (b) interaction with high status peers (c) successful public performance, (d) support and individual attention from the teacher, and (e) concrete awards given at the end of the performance.

Various techniques have proven to be successful in developing peer acceptance. Jones and others (1981) used simulations of handicapping conditions, interviews with handicapped individuals, and films and discussions as part of their training program. A total of five hours of such training over a one week period resulted in a significant difference between pre and post-test responses of experimental groups to a scale which measured perceptions about the handicapped. Several other studies have described programs which have successfully influenced nonhandicapped students' attitudes toward their handicapped peers through the use of specific single elements of the Jones study.

Cooperative learning experiences, in which all students must master assigned material, are part of the

"mastery learning" concept. Bloom (1971) contends that at least 90% of all students could reach mastery level in material being taught, but not if they received identical instruction.

Meyerowitz (1962) conducted a study involving educable mentally retarded (EMR) students placed in regular classes to determine if they are more or less self-derogative than EMR students in a special class. Sixty entering first-grade students who were identified as being EMR were placed in special classes while another sixty EMR students were placed in regular classrooms. All students were tested at the end of the year using the Illinois Index of Self-Derogation. All 120 EMR students scored significantly higher ($\bar{X}$ 3.6) than the "normal" group ($\bar{X}$ 2.6). EMR students in the regular class were less derogative ($\bar{X}$ 3.0) than EMR students in special classes ($\bar{X}$ 3.4).

In a study involving older children (Gottlieb, Semmel, & Veldman, 1978), "How I Feel Toward Others" was administered to everyone in the class to measure social acceptance and rejection. The results on the sociometric scale showed social status did not improve as EMR students spent more time in the classroom. Teachers' perceptions of EMR students paralleled those

of the nonhandicapped students.

Iano, Ayres, Heller, McGettigan, and Walker (1974) found EMR students who were integrated into the regular classroom, with supportive resource room services available to them, were not accepted any better than the EMR students in previous studies. As part of the above study, children not diagnosed as EMR also received resource room services. They had higher mean rejection scores and lower mean acceptance scores than the regular classroom students. Thus it appears the mere association with a service identified for EMR students reinforced the negative perceptions of others.

Ziegler and Hambleton (1976) compared young TMR students in a school for the retarded. They found no significant differences in the ways TMR students and nonretarded students interacted with peers and nonretarded individuals. Regular classroom placement was found to be extremely effective in promoting interaction between retarded and nonretarded, thus providing a more 'normal' environment for the retarded student.

Fuchigami and Shepherd (1968) studied the social participation of male junior high and senior high EMR students in regular classes and nonclassroom activities.

The results show most adolescent EMR boys usually identify only with other EMR boys as friends and some felt they had no friends at all in the school setting.

Monroe and Howe (1971) also found the amount of time handicapped students are integrated into the regular classroom does not improve their social acceptance.

Warner (1973) found younger children have a more favorable attitude toward special class placement. This positive attitude decreased at the junior high and high school levels, even though indications are that the special class is generally a stimulating and comfortable placement for children who have difficulty in adjusting to other educational placements. The trend is definitely toward more negative attitudes as the child matures. Blumberg (1973) also found the high school years are more difficult due to the desire to be socially acceptable.

The above studies indicate academic integration per se does not significantly affect the social status of EMR students. It does point out that teachers' attitudes and perceptions influence how the other students perceive EMR students.

If teachers are found to influence peers' perceptions of EMR children, attempts to

improve retarded childrens' social position could be directed toward changing teachers' behavior rather than modifying the nature of the interaction between non-retarded and EMR children which is currently the predominate approach to the problem.(Gottlieb, et al.,1978,p.4).

Community attitudes play a tremendous role in the successful implementation of any new school program. If the community holds negative attitudes toward exceptional children, attempts to integrate them into the mainstream of education will be met with opposition. Research seems to indicate that most members of the community have little understanding of the diverse group of exceptionalities. Jones (1974) found a common set of attitudes cut across catagories of disabilities. Higgs (1975) found that members of the community who had a high degree of contact with the handicapped had more knowledge and more positive attitudes than those who did not.

Porter (1975) maintained that preparation for mainstreaming a handicapped student must begin six months prior to the integration of the student in order to achieve an atmosphere for cooperation. The purpose of the planning period is two-fold. First, the introduction of the concept to develop necessary

understanding and cooperation of the community and educational personnel and second, a thorough investigation should be made in an attempt to match each participating handicapped student with the most appropriate classroom teacher. (Based on the compatability of their respective learning and teaching styles).

If cooperation, understanding, and favorable attitudes are necessary during the planning stages of mainstreaming, the literature indicated an even greater need to maintain a high level of cooperation, continued growth in understanding the concept, and hopefully, even improved attitudes of community and educational personnel. Existence of the above conditions will enable the regular classroom teachers to: adopt procedures that accomodate the learning and social needs of each child, develop acceptance for the child with special needs, and receive and utilize competent support of specialists and aides required(Healey, 1975).

Parent Involvement

Studies have shown the need for parent involvement with schools in order to make mainstreaming successful for the handicapped students. These studies confirm the belief that the child who experiences the most success in school is the one whose parents demonstrate interest

in the child's schooling.

Reich, Hambledon, and Klein (1975) studied the relationship between student academic success and parent expectations and parent involvement. They looked at four programs for the hearing impaired students in Canada.

Each of the four programs was based on a different delivery system: 1) full integration of handicapped students, 2) integration with itinerant help, 3) partial integration, and 4) partial segregation. Parents of the students were interviewed to determine the degree of their involvement with the school; the degree of help given the students at home; and parents' expectations for their children's educational achievement. Student achievement was measured by standardized tests and a classroom teacher report. A significant correlation was found between "successful" handicapped elementary students and a high degree of parent involvement in the children's education. Parents of successful children generally contacted teachers on their own initiative, attended school-sponsored events, and visited schools in which their handicapped children were enrolled.

Blacher-Dixon (1979) studied parental involvement of parents of handicapped students. Data from questionnaires sent to educational personnel involved in the mainstreaming

of handicapped preschool students showed that the respondents strongly agreed that parent involvement was a key to mainstreaming success.

Communication

Communication has come to be recognized as a significant contributor to the effective functioning of any organization. In order for a school district to function smoothly, and thus for a concept such as mainstreaming to work, a reliable communication structure must be operational. An ongoing information flow must be established among various educational personnel, between parents and teachers and/or administrators, between the school district and state and federal governmental agencies. The need to maintain these types of effective relationships in order to facilitate successful mainstreaming is brought out in the literature.

Schubert and Glick (1981) included "good communication" among the staff as one of the components of successful mainstreaming programs. They described good communication as communication that was open, honest, frequent, and informal.

Tarrier (1978) conducted a study of identified administrative components important to the effective

operation of schools. Of particular importance to the area of communication was the mention of community relations as one of the significant components of a mainstreaming program. The focus in this component was on the interaction and close contact between the school programs and various agencies and special interest groups in the community.

Blacher-Dixon's (1979) study of success factors for mainstreaming also included two elements related to communication between parents and teachers; individual parent-teacher conferences, and informal exchange between teachers and parents. The second factor was similar to the findings in Schubert and Glick's study which showed the importance of informal communication among staff members. Thus it appears when the lines of communication are open between individuals involved in mainstreaming, cooperation in problem-solving and coordination of efforts may take place.

Prior to full integration of a handicapped student into the mainstream, a social worker or other school personnel serves as a liaison between the school and the home. The management of the initial integration is characterized by observation of the student's adjustment to the new environment and the need for

close communication between the regular teacher and special education personnel for the purpose of providing whatever support services necessary to assist in both academic and behavioral adjustment at school and home (Grosenick, 1974).

As a result of her research, Grosenick indicated the importance of pre-integration meeting with parents and regular school personnel to "sell the idea of integration." She listed other considerations needed to successfully implement the program as: the cooperativeness of the regular classroom teacher, the compatability of the regular teacher's teaching style and the handicapped student's needs, and the special academic needs of the student as they relate to the school's and regular teacher's flexibility and ability to respond to unique needs.

Administration

Administrative variables related to organizational structure, procedures, and processes have been recognized increasingly in recent research as being important components in the design of successful mainstreaming programs. Sivage (1980) noted that the new demands created by mainstreaming conflict with the historical treatment of handicapped children and with the present

organization of public schools.

Sivage (1982) conducted an investigation to determine the relationship of selected organizational variables to successful implementation of mainstreaming in the elementary school. Nine variables were found to be of importance to the success of a program. Of particular significance was the researcher's finding that "Goal Clarity" had the highest correlation of all the variables to the implementation of effective mainstreaming programs. "This variable assessed how clearly the school mainstreaming goals are stated and how well teachers understand how their jobs and work groups will change because of mainstreaming." (Sivage, 1982, p.34) Tarrier (1978) agreed, observing that "if there is one key element of exemplary administrative practices, it is the possession of a clear conceptualization of mainstreaming." (p.27)

Sivage(1982) also noted that a democratic style for principals which allows for team planning was significantly correlated with successful mainstreaming. She also found that schools which had principals who were viewed as advocates (individuals who were thought to defend mainstreaming, recruit supportive members, and secure resources) maintained successful mainstreaming

programs.

Larrivee and Cook (1979) found the level of administrative support to have a significant impact on the attitude of regular class teachers toward mainstreaming. Interestingly, they found a positive correlation between level of administrative support and the availability of support services. It is possible that this correlation reflected teachers' perceptions of greater support services as being an overt display of administrative support.

Siegel (1969) emphasized the importance of the building principal's attitude and the achievement of successful mainstreaming programs. In addition, the building principal should be exposed to a period of indoctrination which may be accomplished through special education coursework, literature, attendance at conferences and workshops. The building principal must also support his teachers by making inservice experiences available, provide necessary materials and competent support services.

Birch (1974) felt the support of the building principal was essential to the smooth implementation of a mainstreaming program. The building principal and his regular and special education staff should

have the autonomy and flexibility to modify program procedures during implementation which reflect the local building's uniqueness of staff and allow greater utilization of the staff's strengths in dealing with the handicapped. Educational assessment and diagnostic teaching should be emphasized without regard to labeling of the students. Instruction should proceed for individual students based on their unique needs as revealed by appropriate diagnostic procedures. The provision of an on-going inservice program was also considered essential.

Inservice teacher education is often considered the weakest and most haphazard component of teacher education (Edelfelt & Lawrence, 1978), even though inservice education for mainstreaming has rather specific goals. PL 94-142 requires regular teachers who have mainstreamed handicapped youngsters in their classes to be competent in diagnosing and evaluating learning styles and problems; be competent in writing individual education programs; have knowledge of the law as well as understanding of the special needs of exceptional children. Many regular teachers presently in classrooms have had little training in these areas.

Most regular classroom teachers are not sure they can handle handicapped children in their classes. While

the majority of teachers believe handicapped children should be in the regular classroom, they feared the negative impact on the children's normal peers. They also feared that the demands on teachers would greatly increase and that they were unprepared to have the handicapped in their classrooms (Harasymiw & Horne, 1976).

Flynn, Gacka, and Sundean (1977) surveyed administrators as well as teachers. The majority of those responding to the questionnaire agreed mainstreaming was a desirable goal, but felt inadequately prepared to handle the needs of mainstreamed exceptional children.

Williams and Algozzine (1979) found that teachers feel differently about persons with specific handicaps. The physically handicapped were the most acceptable in the eyes of the teachers while the mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed were least acceptable.

Staff Development

Programs to prepare regular teachers to effectively instruct handicapped learners in integrated settings are extremely important for the success of the mainstreamed students. Federal mandate requiring staff inservice efforts have forced school districts to develop and

deliver a variety of personnel preparation projects. Many staff training programs include some type of formal training process. Fulton (1976) reported on a modular, special education, competency-based format to train regular teachers to work with handicapped students. The grade point averages of students of participating teachers showed significant improvement, while students of nonparticipating teachers showed negative academic achievement.

A more traditional lecture format (Tutalo, 1975) was used in Project RECAP. Regular classroom teachers were exposed to information relating to student behavior and student management techniques. Teachers then used the techniques in their classrooms and student behavior was assessed. Data indicated student attendance increased, inappropriate behavior decreased somewhat, and the amount of work completed by students increased significantly. Using a similar instructional methodology, Ascione and Borg (1980) provided regular teachers with a four week course specifically focusing on self-concepts. The teachers received information to help them learn behaviors which would increase the self-concept of handicapped students in their classrooms. The self-concept training fostered significant changes in the actions of

the participating teachers.

Glass and Meckler (1972) designed an intensive summer workshop for regular classroom teachers which included diagnostic, remedial, and behavior management skill training. Perhaps more importantly, the teachers had an opportunity to work with handicapped youngsters during the sessions. Post test scores on teacher attitude inventories showed statistically significant gains in the participants' perceptions of their ability to instruct handicapped students in their classrooms.

Purdy (1981) used the team approach to assist regular and special education personnel in the mainstreaming process. Participants were trained in cooperative team building which enabled them to define mainstreaming barriers and eventually create solutions and effect needed changes. Longitudinal data have suggested the success of this organizational approach.

In recent years, more school districts have incorporated follow-up consultations in their inservice programs. The developers of these programs value the availability of an "expert" to assist teachers in the implementation of strategies learned in the formalized workshop sessions.

Programs vary in the length of time consultations

are available. Hale, Prothro, and George (1976) described a semester-long program with consultive services available from a university faculty. Nielsen (1979) described a series of ten workshops with consultations available throughout the school year. Both approaches resulted in significant positive changes occurring in teachers' attitudes and instructional techniques for working with learning disabled students.

Weckler and Youngberg (1975) designed another training model which featured frequent consultations and a low teacher/consultant ratio. This IMPACT program was successful in increasing teachers' use of behavior management, physical arrangement, and learning centers. Davis (1975) included a master teacher in his model who was available to regular classroom teachers within their rooms. This led to increased competency in the experimental group of teachers.

In an effort to differentiate between effective and less effective inservice content which might impact regular teachers' attitudes toward mainstreamed students, Johnson and Cartwright (1979) compared programs in which teachers were given information about and experience with handicapped children to a program providing only experience with handicapped children. Both programs

led to a significant improvement of teachers' attitudes, however, they were unable to establish the superiority of either of these two inservices. Harasymiw and Horne (1976) agreed in part with these findings. They concluded: "attitudes seem best modified when the shift is generated from within the individual as a result of new environmental influences, such as information about the handicapped, as well as direct experience with them." (p.394)

Waggoner (1976) conducted research on modifying the felt needs and attitudes of teachers toward handicapped children. Elementary teachers were provided a diverse inservice training sequence. Post-test scores indicated significant differences in the area of felt needs. Teachers expressed an increased feeling of adequacy in working with handicapped children mainstreamed into their classes. However, no significant differences were found in their attitudes toward these students.

Larrivee (1981) compared the effect on teachers of a six week intensive summer training program which was followed by weekly consultive sessions, with a control group having no inservice, and a group of teachers having monthly inservice throughout the year. Results indicated there were significantly more positive attitudes exhibited by teachers who participated in the intensive training

program.

Lawrence's (1974) review of ninety-seven studies indicated that in general inservice education programs which were located in the schools, which teachers helped to design, and which were conducted by local personnel were found to be most effective. Lawrence found that changing attitudes was the most difficult objective to achieve; possibly because programs in the schools tended to encourage more complex behavior changes. Differentiated experiences, demonstrations, and active participation by teachers seemed to produce desired objectives.

Jordan and Proctor (1969, p.434) concurred stating:

To a great extent, attitudes of an individual toward something in his environment are also dependent upon the amount and quality of information he possesses about the object, person or process...Knowledge without experience is not necessarily effective in altering attitudes.

Studies by Semmel, Gottlieb, and Robinson (1979); Cantrell, Stenner, and Katzenmeyer (1977); Gerber(1978); Williams and Algozzine (1979); and Stephens and Braun (1980) all point out the importance of positive attitudes

on the part of educational personnel as well as the need for its inclusion in a comprehensive inservice program.

Negative attitudes toward mainstreaming, on the part of the regular classroom teachers, diminish as they have more contact with handicapped children. The studies show the three best predictors of a teacher's willingness to include handicapped children in their classes to be; confidence in their ability to teach exceptional children, a belief that handicapped children can become useful members of society, and a belief that public schools should educate the handicapped. There is a correlation between the above and the number of special education courses a person has had.

It appears that sex, age, marital status, size of municipality of residence, number of years since earning bachelor's degree, years of teaching experience, having exceptional children in the family or neighborhood, teaching experience in a school in which there were special education classes, and experience in recommending students for special education evaluations were not significantly related to the classroom teacher's attitude toward integrating handicapped children into regular classrooms (Stephens & Braun, 1981). Central to the

mainstreaming movement is the theme that given the desire, facilities, and reasonable professional preparation, the average teacher can learn to educate exceptional youngsters in the regular classroom; with the support and consultive services of special education personnel (Birch, 1974).

Instruction-Preparatory Skills Training

Walker and others (1981) concentrated on teaching critical behavioral skills needed by handicapped students before they entered the regular classroom, and specific peer-to-peer social group skills. All instruction was undertaken in small groups in the special classroom. All the experimental groups did better than the control groups on seven of the nine dependent variables involved. Social skills training appears to be a potent force in developing successful mainstream classroom candidates. As the author stated, "Systematic social skills training represents one of the best available methods of achieving this goal." (p.35)

Associated with preparing socially competent students to function in the mainstream is the importance of assuring that handicapped students also possess the skills to perform required academics in the regular classroom. Haring and Krug (1975) designed an experimental

study which focused on providing specific instructional interventions. Using continuous data collection procedures, contingency management, and programmed instructional materials, they systematically taught the mainstreaming candidates in self-contained settings. The experimental groups showed greater academic gains in both reading and arithmetic, as well as having a greater number of students returning to the regular classroom.

Peer Interaction Facilitation

A critical factor in the successful mainstreaming of handicapped students is the manner in which the students interact with one another.

Ballard and others (1977) studied small cooperative peer groups, including educable mentally retarded students, in highly structured tasks with little academic content. The results indicated the EMR students were socially accepted by their nonhandicapped classmates after having worked for an extended period of time in cooperative groups.

Peer Teaching

Peer teaching has been shown to produce gains in the academic performance of handicapped students. Sherbenou (1978) had nonhandicapped students tutor

mainstreamed students on pre-algebra skills in the regular classroom. Significant progress was made, and this successful skill acquisition generalized to the classroom. Haisley, Tell, and Andrews (1981) investigated the effectiveness of a peer tutoring model for junior high learning disabled students. They included components in the model which controlled the careful selection, training, and supervision of tutors, and the amount of communication and support the regular class teacher received. The results indicated students who received help from a tutor increased their on-task behavior significantly, resulting in improved grades in those classes where they received tutor help.

Curricular Adaptations

Curricular changes have been implemented in various school settings, but their effectiveness has not been empirically proven. Data from a few programs suggest the feasibility of adapting curricula and materials to meet the special needs of special students mainstreamed into the regular classroom.

Hartwell, Wiseman, and Van Reusen (1979) described the Parallel Alternate Curriculum (PAC), a modified curriculum, which was designed for secondary learning disabled students. Content courses were modified so

students could gather information through those modalities which did not present problems to them. Program evaluations showed strong acceptance by PAC teachers, parents, and students, based on perceptions of student success and student interest in attending school.

Enos (1976) studied the integration of handicapped high school students into a program using field-centered curriculum. The study lasted four years and included handicapped, normal, and gifted students who took part in an individualized, multidisciplinary, multicultural program which alternated periods of classroom work with related field trips. The experimental group showed significantly higher scores on post tests indicating a greater comprehension of the material. The author suggested a field-centered curriculum may be an alternative to the traditional classroom activities, as part of the "imaginative search for better ideas with which to...facilitate the integration of the handicapped into the world of reality." (p.14)

Edwards (1980) reported on the use of a "Modified Curricular Approach" with behavior disordered students. Modifications included the adaptation of texts and workbooks to meet individual reading levels, formulation of objectives, and provisions for immediate feedback and

self-graphing. Students in the experimental group scored significantly higher on tests, displayed greater attention to task, and improved behavior.

Instructional Management

Ritter (1978) reported on support given to handicapped students who were mainstreamed into regular classrooms. Learning disabled students were given supplemental instruction in reading and math for a total of 90 minutes a week. The academic gains of these students were comparable to those exhibited by them during their previous placement in a learning disabilities program.

Another aspect of instructional management systems is the shaping of appropriate student behaviors. Demers (1981) used a daily point system for learning disabled students. Coordination of efforts among classroom teachers, learning disabilities teachers, and parents produced student gains in academic achievement along with decreased disruptive behaviors and higher on-task performance.

Flexibility in the scheduling of activities of handicapped students is an instructional management factor which contributes to the success of mainstreaming. Studies by Tarrier (1978) and Schubert and Glick (1981)

point out the importance of flexibility on the part of the school board and administration as well as scheduling at the building level.

The evaluation of programs serving handicapped students in the regular classroom has typically been presented in terms of whether or not the student "made it" in the regular classroom. Chaffin (1974) investigated thirty on-going programs and found three which submitted data regarding program effectiveness in which control groups were utilized to judge effectiveness.

Grosenick (1974) reported on one positive attempt to evaluate the effects of mainstreaming on handicapped children in the regular classroom. The approach involved a systematic observation of classroom behavior of the mainstreamed students. In effect, her proposed evaluation scheme involved a comparison of the student's performance and behavior in the regular classroom with his pre-integration performance and behavior. According to Grosenick, the student became his own control. This process of continuous measurement of performance and behavior allowed the observer or teacher to detect small deviations and make necessary adjustments and/or employ appropriate remediation tactics.

Little (1976) identified the consultation function of special education personnel as one which must receive significant emphasis as the result of increased interest in mainstreaming and the impetus of PL 94-142. Little maintains they must be able to convey traditional special education diagnostic and instructional procedures and techniques to the regular teachers who typically have been trained to instruct a group of students in the classroom, but who now must respond to the unique needs of individual students. Consequently, special education personnel become inservice trainers of regular teachers.

Special Delivery

Systems providing comprehensive educational services to handicapped students are crucial to the successful implementation of mainstreaming. Service delivery is an all-pervading concept. It encompasses various combinations of program features in attempting to best meet the needs of mainstreamed students. Despite the variety of elements which may be found in service delivery options, the common thread among them is the provision of support to identified students and their teachers in the mainstream setting. Graham and others (1980) emphasized the importance of supportive services when they stated, "if adequate support services...are

not available, the likelihood of providing a mainstreamed handicapped learner with an appropriate education is greatly diminished." (p.128)

The National Association of State Directors of Special Education (1976) identify the function of support personnel as: (1) participate in the referral, evaluation, and placement process, as appropriate, (2) assist in the development and implementation of individualized instructional plans for each handicapped student, (3) provide necessary supportive services for handicapped children (4) provide consultive services to other educational personnel, and (5) participate in periodic reviews of student progress.

As the description of the role of various school personnel implies, a combination of ability, acceptance, and cooperation must be fostered if successful mainstreaming of handicapped students is to result in improved educational opportunity for the handicapped. Fallis (1975), also stated that a strong commitment from each person involved, together with careful planning and preparation, is the essential ingredient for effective integration.

The literature indicated regular classroom placement with consultive services provided by special education

and ancillary personnel is gaining support. Glass (1973) feels that by expanding the continuum of services offered to the mildly handicapped children in the regular classroom, an interface between regular and special education can be developed. Christopolos (1973) feels the exceptional child is best served when specialists help the regular class teachers develop a workable curriculum which allows multiability level success within the context of general education.

The resource program is one of several available service delivery options for educating handicapped students. The resource room, a variation of the resource program, is described by Wiederholt, Hammill, and Brown (1978) as "any setting in the school to which a child comes to receive specific instruction on a regularly scheduled basis, while receiving the major part of his/her education elsewhere." (p.4)

Many researchers have investigated the efficacy of the resource room. Although some, such as Rust, Miller, and Wilson (1978) have questioned the superiority of the resource room over the regular or special class, numerous studies have supported its effectiveness. Many school districts, including the City of Chicago, have found the resource room ideally suited for servicing

large numbers of handicapped students.

Sabatino (1975) compared the academic growth of learning disabled students in three types of special class structures with learning disabled students in the regular class. The special class settings were: (1) self-contained, (2) resource room for one hour per day (Plan A), and (3) resource room for one-half hour twice a week (Plan B). Students in all three experimental class structures showed more gain than did control students in the regular class. The greatest gains were made by learning disabled students in the self-contained setting and in Plan A. Sabatino concluded that Plan A, which promoted prescriptive instruction in behavior modification and remediation, was preferable to the self-contained class as it was capable of accommodating more students. Walker's (1974) study of educable mentally retarded students in self-contained and resource rooms echoed the results of Sabatino's study. She stated that the student's need could be met "as well, if not better, in the resource room program as in the special class." (p. 289)

Ito (1981) also found the rate of achievement of students in resource rooms in reading and spelling was greater than their achievement prior to placement in

resource rooms. However, one year after the students were returned to the regular class, their rate of achievement was not maintained.

In a longitudinal study, Edington (1975) followed 25 learning disabled students who had been in resource rooms during their elementary years. Her ten year follow-up study found that only three had dropped out of school. Many had continued in the regular program with the majority receiving C or above grades. The provision of resource room support at the elementary level appeared to be a positive factor in the education of these mildly handicapped students.

In addition to the provision of services to handicapped students primarily through placement in resource programs, there has been a parallel trend toward support of these students by consultations to regular class teachers by support personnel. A comparison of the teacher consultant model, which provided itinerant teacher service to regular classroom teachers, to the resource room model was conducted by Miller and Sabatino (1978). They found no significant differences on word recognition or arithmetic post-test scores between students in either model. However, both the consultant and resource group produced higher gain

scores than the control group. Though neither model was proven to have an advantage over the other, Miller and Sabatino support the consultation approach because of the greater number of students the consultant was able to serve. Evans (1980) found the resource room teachers spent very little time as consultants to their regular classroom teachers. She also indicated that the regular classroom teachers expressed a desire to see resource teachers spend additional time in a consultive role.

The effectiveness of consulting teacher programs appears to have been established. Wade and Knight (1976) and Cantrell and Cantrell (1976), as well as others, have described programs, yielding statistically significant data, which have enabled handicapped children to stay in the mainstream.

"It is tempting to surmise that borderline intelligence children can be maintained within the regular public school classroom if intensively and specifically trained support teachers are made available to deal with the academic, behavioral, and other problems children pose for the regular classroom teachers."
(pp.384-385)

Semmel, Gottlieb, and Robinson (1979) reviewed

studies comparing the academic achievement of various types of handicapped children in special schools with the academic achievement of handicapped children in regular schools. They found the children in special classes did not achieve more than the handicapped children in regular classes.

The studies also found mainstreaming from the beginning of school was successful, especially when supportive services to regular teachers was immediately available. A common theme through all the studies is that teacher and administrative attitudes, staff preparation, coordinated planning and well-designed instruction are more important factors in successful mainstreaming than the degree of the student's disability.

Cultural factors have contributed to difficulties in mainstreaming many youngsters. Language differences among population subcultures have decreased the capacity of local districts to obtain personnel able to speak the appropriate language. Because some subcultures do not value education as highly as the majority population does, it is difficult to identify and plan for children in such subcultures.

Many handicapped children are able to perform acceptable and productive roles in their subcultures

without the benefit of special education programs, and are not perceived as handicapped by their subculture. As they enter the mainstream of American Society, they often face insurmountable barriers.

Economic class differences placed some degree of restriction on the school district's ability to implement PL 94-142. An additional mitigating factor is the economically deprived family which has more immediate subsistence concerns than the special education needs of their child (Helge, 1981).

Summary

The literature related to mainstreaming is replete with references to court decisions, state and federal legislation, and policies proposed by various advocates of handicapped children. All fifty states have laws governing services for handicapped students which have been upheld by the judiciary. Included in the guaranteed rights of the handicapped is a free public education in the least restrictive environment for all handicapped children regardless of the class or severity of their handicap; and education appropriate to each child's individual needs.

Regardless of the source of the mandate, it is the responsibility of the public schools to plan,

implement, and evaluate programs for handicapped students who are mainstreamed in the regular education program.

Planning and implementation of mainstreaming programs in recent years have often been characterized by intensive efforts directed toward achieving a cooperative working relationship between parents, regular classroom teachers, administrators, special education teachers, and support personnel.

Inservice education is recognized to be a necessary component of a mainstreaming program. Inservice programs have been provided in various ways. The literature suggests that inservice programs should be school based; should be conducted by local personnel; should include demonstrations and hands-on activities; should address the needs of the teachers; and should be on-going, not "one-shot" workshops.

The literature indicated that in addition to training teachers in the competencies mandated by Pl 94-142, inservice programs should attend to teachers' feelings and attitudes about mainstreaming. Neither of these can be met successfully in short, one-shot sessions.

The skills mandated by Pl 94-142 are best learned in active practice sessions, rather than through lectures.

Since not all teachers need training in the mandated areas, the inservice program should be individualized in order to address the different needs of the various participants. Observation of special education teachers working with handicapped students should be included.

One of the concepts that clearly emerges from the literature is that attitudes people hold concerning the handicapped have tremendous impact on the success or failure of efforts to integrate handicapped children into the mainstream of education. The role of the building administrator is especially vital. He must actively support the concept of mainstreaming and participate in the program as a contributing member.

The attitudes of most teachers before integration reveal a rigid idea of the handicapped. They usually ascribe certain characteristics or behaviors to a disability group with little allowance for behavioral differences. Teachers who look at a child's disability before looking at the whole individual often become handicapped themselves in terms of being able to teach that child in their classroom.

Teacher attitudes are invariably transmitted to the nonhandicapped students and the entire environment becomes an untenable one for the handicapped student.

Labels, designed primarily for identifying and providing appropriate services for the handicapped, cannot be an inflexible stereotype of individuals to those so labeled. There seems to be a need to find other means of diagnosing and describing children who need special help so that the process more clearly reflects their potential and not their handicaps.

Unfavorable attitudes and feelings toward handicapped students by their peers and adults need not exist. Research has shown it is possible to change attitudes about handicapped persons from negative to positive. Cooperative learning experiences, as a result of working in relatively small heterogeneous groups in which all members must master the assigned material, lead to understanding of the nature of the handicap and its boundaries as well as the variety of characteristics the handicapped person possesses.

The literature indicated regular classroom placement with consultive services provided by special education and ancillary personnel is gaining support. Studies also support the use of the resource room as a service delivery option for educating handicapped students. Many school districts have found the resource room ideally suited for servicing large numbers of handicapped students.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The study utilized two questionnaires in which subjects responded to the items by indicating, on a Likert-type scale, their opinion as to the importance of the item to a successful mainstreaming program. The subjects also had an opportunity to make any additional comments concerning what they felt was essential for the success of a mainstreaming program. A feasibility study of the resulting model was conducted.

The Sample

The sample surveyed consisted of 95 educators; 40 receiving the first questionnaire, 40 receiving the second, and 15 taking part in the feasibility study. Recipients of the questionnaires and feasibility study were chosen by lot. First, school districts were selected by lot from a list provided by the superintendent of the Educational Service Region of Cook County, Illinois. Next, one school from each district was chosen, also by lot, from the lists provided by the superintendent.

For questionnaires one and two, the principal of the school was sent a cover letter (Appendix A) indicating the purpose of the research; a questionnaire (Appendices B & C) related to the characteristics of a successful mainstreaming program, and an addressed, stamped return envelope.

Subjects were asked to complete the questionnaire and return the form in the envelope provided. Thirty-three subjects (82½%) responded to the first questionnaire while 25 (62½%) responded to the second.

Participants in the feasibility study received a cover letter (Appendix D), a copy of the model and a feasibility questionnaire (Appendix E). Eleven of the fifteen subjects (73⅓%) responded to the feasibility questionnaire.

The Questionnaires

The validity of the instrument was established in a two-fold manner. First, the questionnaire was reviewed by experts in the field of special education. Based on their comments, modifications were made. Second, the questionnaire was sent to 40 educators currently involved with special education programs requesting their evaluation of the individual factors. The respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their agreement by marking a five-point Likert-type scale. A rating of five indicated a factor was considered to be an extremely important characteristic of a successful mainstreaming program, while a one indicated an item was unimportant to the success of a mainstreaming program. Items with a mean score of 2.9 or less were not included in the second

questionnaire. As a result, six items were deleted from the final version of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire, in its final form, was mailed to the second group of 40 educators. As with the first group surveyed, the subjects were assured they would not be personally identified in the study or in any reports or papers associated with the study. They were also assured that data received would not be used for any purpose other than the master's thesis and that participation was voluntary. Results of the study would be shared with the subjects if they so desired. As a result of the second questionnaire, two factors were deleted from the final form of the model.

The factors comprising the model were grouped into eleven categories and sent to 15 administrators. They were asked to indicate the degree to which they felt the factors were capable of being accomplished in general, and specifically for their school, by marking a five-point Likert-type scale.

Analysis of Data

The frequency of various levels of response, on the Likert Scale, was tabulated. Mean scores for each item were computed and rounded to one decimal place. Standard deviations for each item were computed and rounded to two

decimal places.

Questionnaire One was used to establish content validity of the factors of the model mainstreaming program. The responses to the items in the questionnaire are analyzed in tables 1 to 53. The frequency of the various levels of responses, as to the importance of an item to a successful mainstreaming program, has been summarized. The mean response score was computed and rounded to one decimal place, while the standard deviation was computed and rounded to two decimal places. Items with a mean response score of less than 3.0 were not included in the second questionnaire.

The first table deals with community knowledge of PL 94-142.

Table 1

Parents and interested parties in the community should be familiar with PL 94-142 and the ways it will affect the educational programs of the school

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
16	10	4	2	1

N=33
M=4.2
SD=0.83

The mean of 4.2 indicates the experts consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

The following table deals with the community's need to be familiar with the characteristics of various handicaps.

Table 2

Parents and interested parties in the community should be familiarized with various types of handicaps and their characteristics to help minimize negative stereotypes of handicapped students

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
16	12	4	0	1

N=33
M=4.3
SD=0.75

The mean of 4.3 indicates the experts consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

The following table deals with the need for administrators to have a thorough understanding of PL 94-142.

Table 3

All administrators involved in a mainstreaming program
should have a thorough understanding of Public Law
94-142 (Education for All Handicapped Children Act)

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
25	4	3	0	1

N=33
M=4.6
SD=0.75

The mean of 4.6 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

The following table surveys the respondents' views as to the necessity of administrators participating in orientation programs prior to the establishment of a mainstreaming program.

Table 4

School administrators should participate in orientation programs to prepare them to understand the special problems associated with establishing mainstreaming programs and to acquire the leadership skills needed to maintain the programs

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
20	8	3	1	1

N=33
 M=4.4
 SD=0.80

The mean of 4.4 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

The following table deals with parents' involvement in planning the mainstreaming program.

Table 5

Parents of regular and special education students
attending the school should be involved in developing
the mainstreaming program

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
2	10	11	6	4

N=33
M=3.0
SD=1.10

The mean of 3.0 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be valid, however the standard deviation of 1.10 reflects their wide range of views as to its validity.

The following table is concerned with attitudes of school administrators.

Table 6

The process of mainstreaming handicapped students
necessitates a climate exemplified by a positive
attitude exhibited by administrators

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
21	9	2	0	1

N=33
M=4.5
SD=0.77

The mean of 4.5 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the administrators' awareness of resources available within the school district.

Table 7

Local school administrators should be aware of the resources (both in and out of the school district) that would be available to them to provide appropriate instruction for handicapped students

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
19	6	7	0	1

N=33
M=4.3
SD=0.87

The mean of 4.3 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the administrative decentralization of mainstreaming programs.

Table 8

Special education programs should be administratively decentralized with the building principal having total responsibility to implement the concept of mainstreaming

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
5	6	13	7	2

N=33
M=3.2
SD=0.95

The mean of 3.2 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the experts' views of the local administrator's authority to modify the curriculum.

Table 9

The building principal should have the autonomy and flexibility to modify curriculum to meet the unique needs of each handicapped student

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
7	15	8	2	1

N=33
M=3.8
SD=0.77

The mean of 3.8 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views of the need for all educational personnel to be familiar with Public Law 94-142 are analyzed.

Table 10

All educational personnel involved in a mainstreaming
program should have a thorough understanding of Public
Law 94-142

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
17	7	8	0	1

N=33
M=4.2
SD=0.92

The mean of 4.2 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

For the following table, the experts were asked their opinion as to the need for educational personnel to be aware of their rights in mainstreaming.

Table 11

All educational personnel should be aware of their rights
in mainstreaming

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
14	10	7	1	1

N=33
 M=4.1
 SD=0.84

The mean of 4.1 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

The following table reflects the experts' views of the importance of support personnel to the mainstreaming program.

Table 12

The school district should provide support personnel
who will function as a team to aid the regular
classroom teacher and mainstreamed students

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
14	10	6	3	0

N=33
M=4.1
SD=0.80

The mean of 4.1 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the need to have state certification of special education personnel.

Table 13

Special education personnel should be certified by the state education agency in at least one area of special education as defined by the state education agency

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
19	7	5	2	0

N=33
M=4.3
SD=0.95

The mean of 4.3 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

For the following table, the respondents were asked their opinion of the need for job descriptions.

Table 14

There should be a careful definition of roles and responsibilities of all personnel

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
16	6	8	1	2

N=33
M=4.0
SD=1.18

The mean of 4.0 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program. The standard deviation of 1.18 reflects a wider range of views as to its validity.

In the following table, the experts' views of the number of handicapped students to be placed in a regular classroom are analyzed.

Table 15

The number of handicapped children in a regular
classroom should not exceed 10% of the enrollment

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
7	6	10	7	3

N=33
 M=3.2
 SD=1.28

The mean of 3.2 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program. The standard deviation of 1.28 reflects a wider range of views as to its validity.

In the following table, the experts were asked to give their opinion of the need for regular classroom teachers to observe special education teachers working with handicapped youngsters.

Table 16

Regular classroom teachers should observe special education teachers working with handicapped children before the handicapped children are mainstreamed into the regular classroom

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
6	13	7	6	1
N=33				
M=3.5				
SD=1.13				

The mean of 3.5 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program. The standard deviation of 1.13 reflects a wider range of views as to its validity.

In the following table, the experts' views of the necessity of a needs assessment prior to the planning phase of the mainstreaming program are analyzed.

Table 17

The planning phase of a mainstreaming program should include the participation of all educational personnel in a needs assessment

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
9	10	10	1	3

N=33
M=3.6
SD=1.28

The mean of 3.6 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program. The standard deviation of 1.28 reflects a wider range of views as to its validity.

In the following table, the importance of positive attitudes on the part of the teachers is responded to by the experts.

Table 18

Teachers' perceptions of, and attitudes toward, mainstreamed students must be positive

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
22	8	3	0	0

N=33
 M=4.6
 SD=0.45

The mean of 4.6 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views of the use of adult volunteers are analyzed.

Table 19

Adult volunteers should be used as teacher aides to
reinforce and supplement classroom activities

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
0	3	14	6	10

N=33
M=2.3
SD=1.00

The mean of 2.3 indicates the experts in the field do not consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program. Consequently, this item will not be included in the second questionnaire.

In the following table, the experts' views of the use of student aides are analyzed.

Table 20

Teachers should use "regular" students as teacher aides
to reinforce and supplement classroom activities

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
0	4	7	11	11

N=33
M=2.1
SD=1.05

The mean of 2.1 indicates the experts in the field do not consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program. Consequently, this item will not be included in the second questionnaire.

In the following table, the experts' views of the regular classroom teacher's autonomy in the area of curriculum are examined.

Table 21

The teaching staff should have the autonomy and flexibility to modify curriculum to meet the unique needs of each handicapped student

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
11	9	10	2	1

N=33
M=3.8
SD=1.12

The mean of 3.8 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program. The standard deviation of 1.12 reflects a wider range of views as to its validity.

The following table is concerned with the experts' views of the necessity of the regular classroom teacher modifying teaching methods to accomodate handicapped students.

Table 22

Regular classroom teachers should modify instructional materials and adjust their teaching methods to accomodate handicapped students

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
8	16	7	1	1

N=33
M=3.9
SD=0.82

The mean of 3.9 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views of criteria for placing handicapped students in regular classroom are analyzed.

Table 23

The matching of students and teachers should be based on the compatability of their respective teaching and learning styles

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
15	6	8	3	1

N=33
M=3.9
SD=1.28

The mean of 3.9 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program. The standard deviation of 1.28 reflects a wider range of views as to its validity.

In the following table, the experts' views of the importance of educational personnel being aware of resources available to them within the school district are analyzed.

Table 24

All educational personnel should be aware of the resources (both in and out of the school district) which are available to them to provide appropriate instruction for all handicapped students

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
9	16	6	1	1

N=33
M=3.9
SD=1.07

The mean of 3.9 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views of the importance of communication between regular and special education teachers are analyzed.

Table 25

Close communication between the regular and special education teacher is necessary during the period of initial integration into the mainstream

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
22	10	1	0	0

N=33
M=4.6
SD=0.79

The mean of 4.6 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views of the importance of the special education teacher conveying skills to the regular teacher are analyzed.

Table 26

Special education teachers must be able to convey special education diagnostic and instructional procedures and techniques to the regular teacher

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
12	13	5	2	1

N=33

M=4.0

SD=1.01

The mean of 4.0 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views of the importance of including students in planning of the program are reviewed.

Table 27

Whenever possible, students should be involved in the planning for any program they will participate in

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
1	6	12	9	5

N=33
M=2.6
SD=1.19

The mean of 2.6 indicates the experts in the field do not consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program. Consequently, this item will not be included in the second questionnaire.

The following table is concerned with the experts' opinions of assessment and diagnostic teaching techniques.

Table 28

Educational assessment and diagnostic teaching should be emphasized

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
6	15	8	2	2

N=33

M=3.6

SD=1.16

The mean of 3.6 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program. The standard deviation of 1.16 reflects a wider range of views as to its validity.

In the following table, the experts' views regarding the prime responsibility for communicating with the home are analyzed.

Table 29

The classroom teacher has the prime responsibility of communicating with parents of handicapped students in the mainstreaming program

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
1	11	11	5	5

N=33
M=2.9
SD=1.20

The mean of 2.9 indicates the experts in the field do not consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program. Consequently, this item will not be included in the second questionnaire.

In the following table, the experts' views regarding the providing of opportunities for success in the regular classroom are analyzed.

Table 30

Regular classroom teachers should provide natural opportunities for the handicapped student to achieve success and high status

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
11	19	2	0	1

N=33

M=4.2

SD=0.69

The mean of 4.2 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views of the proper classroom atmosphere are analyzed.

Table 31

The general atmosphere of the classroom must be one in which there is a general acceptance of all youngsters

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
20	8	4	0	1

N=33
 M=4.4
 SD= 0.89

The mean of 4.4 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views regarding use of non-academic talents of handicapped students are considered.

Table 32

Non-academic talents of the handicapped should be developed
as a means of increasing peer acceptance

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
13	12	6	1	1

N=33

M=4.1

SD=0.80

The mean of 4.1 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views concerning the responsibility for determining the psychological readiness of handicapped students for mainstreaming are analyzed.

Table 33

The special education teacher should have the primary responsibility to determine the psychological and educational readiness for a handicapped student's integration into the mainstream

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
7	14	9	1	2

N=33
 M=3.7
 SD=1.02

The mean of 3.7 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views concerning the responsibility for introducing the handicapped student to the new educational environment are analyzed.

Table 34

The special education teacher should have the primary responsibility of introducing the handicapped student to the new educational environment and new achievement expectations

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
8	12	10	1	2

N=33
M=3.7
SD=1.05

The mean of 3.7 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views concerning the structuring of the learning environment are analyzed.

Table 35

Structured opportunities are provided to enable handicapped and nonhandicapped students to discover similarities between themselves

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
6	15	9	2	1

N=33
M=3.7
SD=0.93

The mean of 3.7 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views concerning the need for all students to recognize varying abilities in all people are analyzed.

Table 36

Handicapped and nonhandicapped students must understand that all people vary in their abilities, capacities, and talents

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
15	11	5	0	2

N=33
 $\bar{X}$ =4.1
 SD=1.14

The mean of 4.1 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program. The standard deviation of 1.14 reflects a wider range of views as to its validity.

In the following table, the experts' views regarding the participation of nonhandicapped students in orientation programs are analyzed.

Table 37

Nonhandicapped students should participate in an orientation program which stresses awareness of the special problems of and acceptance of handicapped people

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
8	11	7	4	3

N=33
M=3.5
SD=1.28

The mean of 3.5 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program. The standard deviation of 1.28 reflects a wider range of views as to its validity.

In the following table, the experts' views regarding overt rejection of handicapped students are analyzed.

Table 38

Overt rejection of handicapped students must be dealt
with openly

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
15	8	8	1	1

N=33
M=4.1
SD=0.88

The mean of 4.1 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

The following table reflects the experts' views regarding unacceptable behavior by handicapped students.

Table 39

Unacceptable behavior by handicapped students must not
be tolerated

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
12	9	10	1	1

N=33
M=3.9
SD=1.06

The mean of 3.9 indicates the experts in the field consider this to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views regarding responsibility for conducting inservice for regular classroom teachers are analyzed.

Table 40

It is the responsibility of the administration to provide formal and/or informal inservice for the "regular" classroom teacher

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
10	14	7	1	1

N=33
M=3.9
SD=1.10

The mean of 3.9 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views regarding the responsibility of the special education teachers and ancillary personnel to conduct inservice programs are analyzed.

Table 41

It is the responsibility of the special education teachers and ancillary personnel to provide formal and/or informal inservice for the "regular" teachers

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
6	13	9	3	2

N=33

M=3.5

SD=1.22

The mean of 3.5 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program. The standard deviation of 1.22 reflects a wider range of views as to its validity.

In the following table, the experts' views regarding the inclusion of individual and group assessment materials in an inservice program are analyzed.

Table 42

The use of individual and group assessment materials
and techniques should be part of an inservice program

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
1	15	11	4	2

N=33
M=3.3
SD=0.83

The mean of 3.3 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views regarding the planning of inservice programs are analyzed.

Table 43

Inservice programs should be jointly planned by local administrators and teachers

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
9	14	8	1	1

N=33
M=3.9
SD=0.85

The mean of 3.9 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views regarding the use of local school personnel to conduct inservice programs are analyzed.

Table 44

Inservice programs should be conducted by local school personnel

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
3	7	10	8	5

N=33
M=2.8
SD=1.30

The mean of 2.8 indicates the experts in the field do not consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program. Consequently, this item will not be included in the second questionnaire.

In the following table, the experts' views regarding the types of inservice activities are analyzed.

Table 45

Inservice programs should include demonstrations and hands-on activities

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
2	13	12	5	1

N=33
M=3.3
SD=0.92

The mean of 3.3 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views regarding the inclusion of attitude adjustment in an inservice program are analyzed.

Table 46

Inservice programs should attend to teachers' attitudes
about mainstreaming

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
9	17	5	1	1

N=33
M=4.0
SD= 0.76

The mean of 4.0 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views regarding the inclusion of behavior modification in an inservice program are analyzed.

Table 47

Behavior modification should be part of the inservice
program

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
4	12	9	4	4

N=33
M=3.2
SD=1.29

The mean of 3.2 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program. The standard deviation of 1.29 reflects a wider range of views as to its validity.

The following table reflects the experts' views as to the duration of an inservice program.

Table 48

Inservice programs should be of long-term duration

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
1	5	15	4	8

N=33
M=2.6
SD=1.11

The mean of 2.6 indicates the experts in the field do not consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program. Consequently, this item will not be included in the second questionnaire.

In the following table, the experts' views regarding the system of reporting pupil progress are analyzed.

Table 49

The system for reporting pupil progress should be detailed, specific, and flexible enough to insure that each child's progress is reported on an individual rather than comparative basis

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
13	12	6	1	1

N=33
 M=4.1
 SD=0.80

The mean of 4.1 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

The following table reflects the experts' views as to how student behavioral and academic progress should be measured.

Table 50

Student behavioral and academic progress should be measured by the degree to which the individualized goals and objectives were achieved

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
13	13	7	0	0

N=33
M=4.2
SD=0.65

The mean of 4.2 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views regarding the assessment of pupil progress in the mainstream are analyzed.

Table 51

The progress of the handicapped student in the regular classroom should be compared to his pre-integration performance and behavior

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
10	14	7	1	1

N=33
M=3.9
SD=1.10

The mean of 3.9 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the following table, the experts' views regarding the responsibility for communicating with the home of the integrated student are analyzed.

Table 52

Communication with parents of handicapped children should be a shared responsibility of the classroom teacher, special education personnel, and the building principal

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
20	8	4	1	0

N=33

M=4.4

SD=0.94

The mean of 4.4 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

In the final table, the experts' views regarding the need for a continuing information and education system are analyzed.

Table 53

A continuing information and education system should be developed which will furnish data to parents of the handicapped, administrators, and others involved in the program so that progress can be assessed and new goals set

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
10	12	9	1	1

N=33
M=3.9
SD=0.89

The mean of 3.9 indicates the experts in the field consider this item to be a valid element of a mainstreaming program.

Questionnaire Two was used to determine which factors would comprise the model. The responses to the items in the questionnaire are analyzed in tables 54 to 100. The frequency of the various levels of responses, as to the importance of a factor to a successful mainstreaming program, has been summarized. The mean response score was computed and rounded to one decimal place, while the standard deviation was computed and rounded to two decimal places. Items with a mean response score of less than 3.0 were not included in the model.

The next table deals with community knowledge of PL 94-142.

Table 54

Parents and interested parties in the community should be familiar with PL 94-142 and the ways it will affect the educational programs of the school

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
10	4	11	0	0

N=25
M=4.0
SD=0.92

The mean of 4.0 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table deals with the community's need to be familiar with the characteristics of various handicaps.

Table 55

Parents and interested parties in the community should be familiarized with various types of handicaps and their characteristics to help minimize negative stereotypes of handicapped students

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
11	7	5	2	0

N=25
 M=4.1
 SD=0.98

The mean of 4.1 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table deals with the need for administrators to have a thorough understanding of PL 94-142.

Table 56

All administrators involved in a mainstreaming program
should have a thorough understanding of Public Law
94-142 (Education for All Handicapped Children Act)

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
14	7	4	0	0

N=25
M=4.4
SD=0.75

The mean of 4.4 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table surveys the respondents' views as to the necessity of administrators participating in orientation programs prior to the establishment of a mainstreaming program.

Table 57

School administrators should participate in orientation programs to prepare them to understand the special problems associated with establishing mainstreaming programs and to acquire the leadership skills needed to maintain the programs

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
11	12	2	0	0

N=25
M=4.4
SD=0.62

The mean of 4.4 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table deals with parents' involvement in planning the mainstreaming program.

Table 58

Parents of "regular" and special education students
attending the school should be involved in developing
the mainstreaming program

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
2	1	7	10	5

N=25
M=2.4
SD=1.10

The mean of 2.4 indicates the educators do not consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program. Consequently, this factor will not be included in the model.

The following table is concerned with attitudes of school administrators.

Table 59

The process of mainstreaming handicapped students
necessitates a climate exemplified by a positive
attitude exhibited by administrators

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
16	5	4	0	0

N=25
M=4.5
SD=0.75

The mean of 4.5 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the administrators' awareness of resources available to implement a program.

Table 60

Local school administrators should be aware of the resources (both in and out of the school district) that would be available to them to provide appropriate instruction for handicapped students

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
17	6	2	0	0

N=25

M=4.6

SD=0.63

The mean of 4.6 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the administrative decentralization of mainstreaming programs.

Table 61

Special education programs should be administratively decentralized with the building principal having total responsibility to implement the concept of mainstreaming

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
2	5	10	4	4

N=25
M=2.9
SD=1.14

The mean of 2.9 indicates the educators do not consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program. Consequently, this factor will not be included in the model.

The following table is concerned with the educators' views of the local administrator's authority to modify the curriculum.

Table 62

The building principal should have the autonomy and flexibility to modify curriculum to meet the unique needs of each handicapped student

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
5	14	3	3	0

N=25

M=3.8

SD=0.88

The mean of 3.8 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the need for all educational personnel to be familiar with PL 94-142.

Table 63

All educational personnel involved in a mainstreaming
program should have a thorough understanding of Public
Law 94-142

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
11	6	4	3	1

N=25

M=3.9

SD=1.20

The mean of 3.9 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program. The standard deviation of 1.20 reflects a wider range of views as to its validity.

The following table is concerned with the need of educational personnel to be aware of their rights in mainstreaming.

Table 64

All educational personnel should be aware of their rights
in mainstreaming

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
13	5	5	2	0

N=25

M=4.2

SD=1.00

The mean of 4.2 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table deals with the importance of support personnel to the mainstreaming program.

Table 65

The school district should provide support personnel
who will function as a team to aid the regular
classroom teacher and mainstreamed students

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
13	6	6	0	0

N=25
M=4.3
SD=0.82

The mean of 4.3 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the need to have state certification of special education personnel.

Table 66

Special education personnel should be certified by the state education agency in at least one area of special education as defined by the state education agency

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
14	4	6	0	1

N=25
M=4.2
SD=1.06

The mean of 4.2 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the need for job descriptions for all educational personnel.

Table 67

There should be a careful definition of roles and responsibilities of all personnel

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
9	7	8	1	0

N=25
M=4.0
SD=0.92

The mean of 4.0 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the number of handicapped students to be placed in the regular classroom.

Table 68

The number of handicapped children in a regular
classroom should not exceed 10% of the enrollment

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
7	4	6	4	4

N=25
 M=3.2
 SD=1.42

The mean of 3.2 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program. The standard deviation of 1.42 reflects a wider range of views as to its validity.

The following table is concerned with the need for regular classroom teachers to observe special education teachers working with handicapped students.

Table 69

Regular classroom teachers should observe special education teachers working with handicapped children before the handicapped children are mainstreamed into the regular classroom

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
2	5	13	5	0

N=25
 M=3.2
 SD=0.83

The mean of 3.2 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the necessity of a needs assessment prior to the planning phase of the mainstreaming program.

Table 70

The planning phase of a mainstreaming program should include the participation of all educational personnel in a needs assessment

Extremely Important	Very Important	Importsnt	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
5	9	10	1	0

N=25
M=3.7
SD=0.82

The mean of 3.7 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the importance of positive attitudes on the part of teachers.

Table 71

Teachers' perceptions of, and attitudes toward, mainstreamed students must be positive

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
20	3	2	0	0

N=25

M=4.7

SD=0.60

The mean of 4.7 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the teaching staff having the autonomy to modify curriculum.

Table 72

The teaching staff should have the autonomy and flexibility to modify curriculum to meet the unique needs of each handicapped student

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
12	9	4	0	0

N=25
M=4.3
SD=0.73

The mean of 4.3 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the necessity of the regular classroom teacher modifying teaching methods to accomodate handicapped students.

Table 73

Regular classroom teachers should modify instructional materials and adjust their teaching methods to accomodate handicapped students

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
6	9	10	0	0

N=25
M=3.8
SD=0.78

The mean of 3.8 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with criteria for placing handicapped students into the regular classroom.

Table 74

The matching of students and teachers should be based on the compatability of their respective teaching and learning styles

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
8	8	7	2	0

N=25
M=3.9
SD=0.95

The mean of 3.9 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the importance of educational personnel being aware of resources available to them both in and out of the school district.

Table 75

All educational personnel should be aware of the resources (both in and out of the school district) which are available to them to provide appropriate instruction for all handicapped students

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
11	6	8	0	0

N=25
 M=4.1
 SD=0.87

The mean of 4.1 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the importance of communication between regular and special education teachers.

Table 76

Close communication between the regular and special education teacher is necessary during the period of initial integration into the mainstream

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
19	3	3	0	0

N=25
M=4.6
SD=0.69

The mean of 4.6 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the importance of special education teachers conveying skills to the regular classroom teacher.

Table 77

Special education teachers must be able to convey special education diagnostic and instructional procedures and techniques to the regular teacher

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
8	10	7	0	0

N=25
M=4.0
SD=0.92

The mean of 4.0 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the emphasis of educational assessment and diagnostic teaching.

Table 78

Educational assessment and diagnostic teaching should be emphasized

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
5	7	12	1	0

N=25
M=3.6
SD=0.84

The mean of 3.6 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with providing natural opportunities for handicapped students to achieve success and high status.'

Table 79

Regular classroom teachers should provide natural opportunities for the handicapped student to achieve success and high status

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
10	10	5	0	0

N=25

M=4.2

SD=0.75

The mean of 4.2 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the proper classroom atmosphere.

Table 80

The general atmosphere of the classroom must be one in which there is a general acceptance of all youngsters

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
15	7	3	0	0

N=25

M=4.5

SD=0.70

The mean of 4.5 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the use of non-academic talents of handicapped students.

Table 81

Non-academic talents of the handicapped should be developed
as a means of increasing peer acceptance

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
9	8	6	2	0

N=25
M=4.0
SD=0.96

The mean of 4.0 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the psychological readiness of handicapped students for mainstreaming.

Table 82

The special education teacher should have the primary responsibility to determine the psychological and educational readiness for a handicapped student's integration into the mainstream

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
9	8	6	2	0

N=25
 M=4.0
 SD=0.96

The mean of 4.0 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the responsibility for introducing the handicapped student to the new educational environment.

Table 83

The special education teacher should have the primary responsibility of introducing the handicapped student to the new educational environment and new achievement expectations

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
8	4	10	3	0

N=25
 M=3.7
 SD=1.05

The mean of 3.7 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with structuring the learning environment.

Table 84

Structured opportunities are provided to enable handicapped and nonhandicapped students to discover similarities between themselves

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
1	9	14	1	0

N=25

M=3.4

SD=0.63

The mean of 3.4 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with all students recognizing both handicapped and nonhandicapped have varying degrees of ability.

Table 85

Handicapped and nonhandicapped students must understand that all people vary in their abilities, capacities, and talents

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
14	5	6	0	0

N=25
M=4.3
SD=0.84

The mean of 4.3 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with participation of nonhandicapped students in orientation programs.

Table 86

Nonhandicapped students should participate in an orientation program which stresses awareness of the special problems of, and acceptance of, handicapped people

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
4	7	11	2	1

N=25
M=3.4
SD=0.98

The mean of 3.4 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with overt rejection of handicapped students.

Table 87

Overt rejection of handicapped students must be dealt
with openly

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
8	7	7	3	0

N=25
M=3.8
SD=1.02

The mean of 3.8 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with unacceptable behavior by handicapped students.

Table 88

Unacceptable behavior by handicapped students must not
be tolerated

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
9	9	6	1	0

N=25
M=4.0
SD=0.87

The mean of 4.0 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with responsibility for conducting inservice for regular classroom teachers.

Table 89

It is the responsibility of the administration to provide formal and/or informal inservice for the "regular" classroom teacher

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
9	11	5	0	0

N=25
M=4.2
SD=0.73

The mean of 4.2 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the responsibility of special education teachers and ancillary personnel to conduct inservice programs.

Table 90

It is the responsibility of the special education teachers and ancillary personnel to provide formal and/or informal inservice for the "regular" teachers

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
5	8	8	3	1

N=25
M=3.5
SD=1.06

The mean of 3.5 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the inclusion of group and individual assessment materials in an inservice program.

Table 91

The use of individual and group assessment materials
and techniques should be part of an inservice program

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
3	6	13	3	0

N=25

M=3.4

SD=0.84

The mean of 3.4 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the planning of inservice programs.

Table 92

Inservice programs should be jointly planned by local administrators and teachers

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
8	8	9	0	0

N=25
M=4.0
SD=0.82

The mean of 4.0 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the content of inservice programs.

Table 93

Inservice programs should include demonstrations and hands-on activities

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
5	10	8	2	0

N=25
M=3.7
SD=0.87

The mean of 3.7 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the inclusion of attitude adjustment in a teacher inservice program.

Table 94

Inservice programs should attend to teachers' attitudes
about mainstreaming

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
8	11	4	2	0

N=25
M=3.9
SD=1.20

The mean of 3.9 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program. The standard deviation of 1.20 reflects a wider range of views as to its validity.

The following table is concerned with the inclusion of behavior modification in an inservice program.

Table 95

Behavior modification should be part of the inservice
program

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
3	9	7	4	2

N=25
M=3.3
SD=1.11

The mean of 3.3 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the system for reporting pupil progress.

Table 96

The system for reporting pupil progress should be detailed, specific, and flexible enough to insure that each child's progress is reported on an individual rather than comparative basis

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
4	12	9	0	0

N=25
M=3.8
SD=0.69

The mean of 3.8 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the measurement of student behavioral and academic progress.

Table 97

Student behavioral and academic progress should be measured by the degree to which the individualized goals and objectives were achieved

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
6	11	7	1	0

N=25
M=3.9
SD=0.82

The mean of 3.9 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with assessment of the handicapped student's progress in the mainstream.

Table 98

The progress of the handicapped student in the regular classroom should be compared to his pre-integration performance and behavior

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
4	11	8	2	0

N=25
 M=3.7
 SD=0.84

The mean of 3.7 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the responsibility for communicating with the home of mainstreamed students.

Table 99

Communication with parents of handicapped children should be a shared responsibility of the classroom teacher, special education personnel, and the building principal

Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
5	4	3	2	1
6	10	7	1	1

N=25
M=3.8
SD=0.99

The mean of 3.8 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The following table is concerned with the need for a continuing information and education system.

Table 100

A continuing information and education system should be developed which will furnish data to parents of the handicapped, administrators, and others involved in the program so that progress can be assessed and new goals set

Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
3	12	10	0	0

N=25
M=3.7
SD=0.66

The mean of 3.7 indicates the educators consider this item to be a valid factor for a model mainstreaming program.

The factors comprising the model were grouped into categories and sent to 15 local school administrators. Two sections concerning student orientation time and teacher orientation time, prior to the implementation of the mainstreaming program, were added to the model. These sections evolved from the study of the literature and appear as tables 101 and 102.

The educators were sent a feasibility questionnaire and asked to indicate the degree to which they felt the factors were capable of being accomplished in general, and specifically for their school, by marking a five-point, Likert-type scale. The frequency of the various levels of responses was tabulated. The mean response score for each section of the questionnaire was computed and rounded to one decimal place, while the standard deviation was computed and rounded to two decimal places.

Sections of the model with a mean response score of 1.0 to 1.9 indicated they were considered to be unfeasible. A mean score of 2.0 to 2.9 indicated a section was considered to be somewhat unfeasible. A mean score of 3.0 to 3.9 indicated a section was considered to be feasible. A mean score of 4.0 to 4.9 indicated a section was considered to be very feasible, while a section with a mean score of 5.0 was considered to be extremely feasible. The responses to the feasibility study are summarized in tables 101 to 111.

Table 101
Feasibility Study Item I: Student Orientation Time

In General

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
0	2	6	2	1
N=11		M=2.8		SD=0.89

The mean of 2.8 indicates the educators consider the student orientation time, in general, to be somewhat unfeasible.

For My School

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
0	2	5	2	2
N=11		M=2.6		SD=1.07

The mean of 2.6 indicates the educators consider the student orientation time, for their school, to be somewhat unfeasible

Both items reported in the table above were added to the model, having evolved from a study of the literature.

Table 102
Feasibility Study Item II: Teacher Orientation Time

In General

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
0	3	4	4	0
N=11		M=2.9		SD=0.83

The mean of 2.9 indicates the educators consider the teacher orientation time, in general, to be somewhat unfeasible.

For My School

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
0	1	5	2	3
N=11		M=2.4		SD=0.89

The mean of 2.4 indicates the educators consider the teacher orientation time, for their school, to be somewhat unfeasible.

Both items reported in the table above were added to the model, having evolved from a study of the literature.

Table 103
Feasibility Study Item III: Ancillary Personnel Factors

In General

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
3	3	5	0	0
N=11		M=3.8	SD=0.91	

The mean of 3.8 indicates the educators consider the ancillary personnel factors, in general, to be feasible.

For My School

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
3	4	3	1	0
N=11		M=3.8	SD=1.01	

The mean of 3.8 indicates the educators consider the ancillary personnel factors, for their school, to be feasible.

Table 104
Feasibility Study Item IV: Administrative Factors

In General

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
5	2	4	0	0
N=11		M=4.1		SD=0.86

The mean of 4.1 indicates the educators consider the administrative factors, in general, to be very feasible.

For My School

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
3	3	4	1	0
N=11		M=3.7		SD=1.06

The mean of 3.7 indicates the educators consider the administrative factors, for their school, to be feasible.

Table 105
Feasibility Study Item V: Parent/Community Relations
Factors

In General

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
2	2	4	3	0
N=11		M=3.3		SD=0.96

The mean of 3.3 indicates the educators consider the parent/community relations factors, in general, to be feasible.

For My School

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
1	0	7	3	0
N=11		M=2.9		SD=0.83

The mean of 2.9 indicates the educators consider the parent/community relations factors, for their school, to be somewhat unfeasible.

Table 106
Feasibility Study Item VI: Curriculum Factors

In General

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
4	6	0	1	0
N=11		M=4.2		SD=0.74

The mean of 4.2 indicates the educators consider the curriculum factors, in general, to be very feasible.

For My School

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
4	4	1	2	0
N=11		M=3.9		SD=1.12

The mean of 3.9 indicates the educators consider the curriculum factors, for their school, to be feasible.

Table 107
Feasibility Study Item VII: Teacher Orientation/Inservice
Factors

In General

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
1	5	5	0	0
N=11		M=3.6		SD=0.82

The mean of 3.6 indicates the educators consider the teacher orientation/inservice factors, in general, to be feasible.

For My School

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
0	3	7	1	0
N=11		M=3.2		SD=0.46

The mean of 3.2 indicates the educators consider the teacher orientation/inservice factors, for their school, to be feasible.

Table 108
Feasibility Study Item VIII: Educational Environment
Factors

In General

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
1	6	3	1	0
N=11		M=3.6	SD=0.93	

The mean of 3.6 indicates the educators consider the educational environment factors, in general, to be feasible.

For My School

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
2	4	4	1	0
N=11		M=3.6	SD=1.02	

The mean of 3.6 indicates the educators consider the educational environment factors, for their school, to be feasible.

Table 109
Feasibility Study Item IX: Communication Factors

In General

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
5	4	2	0	0
N=11		M=4.3		SD=0.57

The mean of 4.3 indicates the educators consider the communication factors, in general, to be very feasible.

For My School

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
5	3	3	0	0
N=11		M=4.2		SD=0.74

The mean of 4.2 indicates the educators consider the communication factors, for their school, to be very feasible.

Table 110
Feasibility Study Item X: Student Orientation Factors

In General

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
3	5	3	0	0
N=11		M=4.0		SD=0.74

The mean of 4.0 indicates the educators consider the student orientation factors, in general, to be very feasible.

For My School

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
1	5	5	0	0
N=11		M=3.6		SD=0.82

The mean of 3.6 indicates the educators consider the student orientation factors, for their school, to be feasible.

Table 111
Feasibility Study Item XI: Student Assessment Factors

In General

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
4	5	1	1	0
N=11		M=4.1		SD=0.86

The mean of 4.1 indicates the educators consider the student assessment factors, in general, to be very feasible.

For My School

Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
5	4	3	2	1
3	4	3	1	0
N=11		M=3.8		SD=1.01

The mean of 3.8 indicates the educators consider the student assessment factors, for their school, to be feasible.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Introduction

The questionnaires consisted of two parts. The first part of questionnaire one was comprised of 53 statements to which the respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their agreement by marking a five-point Likert-type scale. Questionnaire two contained 47 statements, while the feasibility study contained 11. A rating of five indicated an item was considered to be extremely important to the success of a mainstreaming program. A rating of one indicated an item was considered to be unimportant.

The second part of questionnaires one and two consisted of a final item in which the respondents were asked to list any other essential factors of a successful mainstreaming program they felt may not have been covered in part one.

Part two of the feasibility study consisted of an item, after each section of the model, in which the respondents were asked to comment.

Summary of Findings for Section One of the Questionnaires

The following two conditions were formulated to determine whether a factor was included in the model:

1. Any factor which received a mean score of 3.0 to 5.0 was included in the model.
2. Any factor which did not attain a mean score of at least 3.0 was eliminated.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis of this study was: Interested parties in Cook County, Illinois Elementary School Districts, outside the City of Chicago, will be able to determine the factors needed for a successful elementary school mainstreaming program.

Questionnaire One was used to help establish content validity. The mean and standard deviation were computed for each of the 53 items. The means of the responses to six items (items 19, 20, 27, 29, 44, and 48) were less than 3.0. Consequently, they were not included in the second questionnaire. Tables 1 to 53 display the frequency, mean, and standard deviation of the responses. Appendix H summarizes the means and standard deviations for all items in Questionnaire One.

Questionnaire Two was utilized to determine the success factors for effective mainstreaming of handicapped students in the 1980's. The means of the responses to two items (items 5 and 8) were less than 3.0. As a result, they were not included in the model. The standard deviation

of nine factors (items 10, 11, 13, 15, 30, 34, 37, 41, and 42) was 1.00 or greater reflecting a wider range of views as to their value to the model. Tables 54 to 100 display the frequency of the various responses as well as the means and standard deviations of those responses. Appendix I summarizes the means and standard deviations for all items in Questionnaire Two.

A feasibility study of the model program for the mainstreaming of handicapped students at the elementary school level was then devised. It contained the success factors generated by Questionnaire Two as well as sections concerning student orientation time and teacher orientation time prior to the implementation of the mainstreaming program. The sections dealing with teacher and student orientation time (sections I and II) evolved from a study of the literature.

A questionnaire concerning the model's general and specific feasibility was sent to 15 administrators. A rating of five indicated a section of the model was considered to be extremely feasible; a rating of four, very feasible; a rating of three, feasible; a rating of two, somewhat unfeasible; and a rating of one, unfeasible. Tables 101 to 111 display the frequency of the various responses as well as the means and standard deviations

of those responses.

The means of the responses to two sections of the model (sections I and II) were less than 3.0, indicating the evaluators considered them to be somewhat unfeasible; both in general, and specifically for their school.

The mean of the responses to the specific feasibility of one section of the model (section V) was less than 3.0. The evaluators considered this section to be somewhat unfeasible for their school although in general they thought it to be feasible.

The evaluators considered all the remaining sections of the model to be very feasible or feasible. Appendix J summarizes the means and standard deviations for all sections of the feasibility study.

The model, as it was presented to the administrators in the feasibility study, follows.

FACTORS FOR SUCCESSFUL MAINSTREAMING
OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS

I. Student Orientation Time

Handicapped and nonhandicapped students will take part in an eight week orientation program. It will be part of the group guidance program and will require two periods a week.

II. Teacher Orientation Time

Teachers will take part in an eight week orientation/inservice program which will require two hours a week. Consultive services will be available throughout the school year.

III. Ancillary Personnel Factors

1. Consultive services will be provided throughout the school year by the learning disabilities specialist, educable mentally retarded specialist, behavior disorder specialist, school psychologist, social worker, teacher-nurse, hearing specialist, and speech and language specialist.
2. Ancillary personnel will be provided by the school district.

IV. Administrative Factors

1. All administrators involved in a mainstreaming program should have a thorough understanding of

Public Law 94-142 (Education for All Handicapped Children Act).

2. School administrators should participate in orientation programs to prepare them to understand the special problems associated with establishing mainstreaming programs and to acquire the leadership skills needed to maintain the programs.
3. The process of mainstreaming handicapped students necessitates a climate exemplified by a positive attitude exhibited by administrators.
4. Local school administrators should be aware of the resources (both in and out of the school district) that would be available to them to provide appropriate instruction for handicapped students.
5. The school district should provide support personnel who will function as a team to aid the regular classroom teacher and mainstreamed students.
6. Special education personnel should be certified by the state agency in at least one area of special education as defined by the state education agency.
7. There should be a careful definition of roles and responsibilities of all personnel.
8. The number of handicapped children in a regular classroom should not exceed 10% of the enrollment.
9. The planning phase of a mainstreaming program

should include the participation of all educational personnel in a needs assessment.

10. The matching of students and teachers should be based on the compatibility of their respective teaching and learning styles.
11. It is the responsibility of the administration to provide formal and/or informal inservice for the "regular" classroom teacher.

V. Parent/Community Relations Factors

1. Parents and interested parties in the community should be familiar with PL 94-142 and the ways it will affect the educational program of the school.
2. Parents and interested parties in the community should be familiarized with various types of handicaps and their characteristics to help minimize negative stereotypes of handicapped students.

VI. Curriculum Factors

1. The building principal should have the autonomy and flexibility to modify curriculum to meet the unique needs of each handicapped student.
2. The teaching staff should have the autonomy and flexibility to modify curriculum to meet the unique needs of each handicapped student.

VII. Teacher Orientation/Inservice Factors

1. All educational personnel involved in a mainstreaming program should have a thorough understanding of PL 94-142.
2. All educational personnel should be aware of their rights in mainstreaming.
3. Regular classroom teachers should observe special education teachers working with handicapped children before the handicapped children are mainstreamed into the regular classroom.
4. Teachers' perceptions of, and attitudes toward, mainstreamed students must be positive.
5. All educational personnel should be aware of the resources (both in and out of the school district) which are available to them to help provide appropriate instruction for handicapped students.
6. Special education teachers must be able to convey special education diagnostic and instructional procedures and techniques to the regular teacher.
7. Educational assessment and diagnostic teaching should be emphasized.
8. It is the responsibility of the special education teachers and ancillary personnel to provide formal and/or informal inservice for the regular teachers.
9. The use of individual and group assessment materials and techniques should be part of an inservice program.

10. Inservice programs should be jointly planned by local administrators and teachers.
11. Inservice programs should include demonstrations and hands-on activities.
12. Inservice programs should attend to teachers' attitudes about mainstreaming.
13. Behavior modification should be part of the inservice program.

VIII. Educational Environment Factors

1. The general atmosphere of the classroom must be one in which there is general acceptance of all youngsters.
2. Regular classroom teachers should modify instructional materials and adjust their teaching methods to accomodate handicapped students.
3. Regular classroom teachers should provide natural opportunities for the handicapped student to achieve success and high status.
4. Non-academic talents of the handicapped should be developed as a means of increasing peer acceptance.
5. Structured opportunities are provided to enable handicapped and nonhandicapped students to discover similarities between themselves.
6. Overt rejection of handicapped students must be dealt with openly.

7. Unacceptable behavior by handicapped students must not be tolerated.

IX. Communication Factors

1. Close communication between the regular and special education teacher is necessary during the period of initial integration into the mainstream.
2. Communication with parents of handicapped children should be a shared responsibility of the classroom teacher, special education personnel, and the building principal.
3. A continuing information and education system should be developed which will furnish data to parents of the handicapped, administrators, and others involved in the program so the program can be assessed and new goals set.

X. Student Orientation Factors

1. The special education teacher should have the primary responsibility to determine the psychological and educational readiness for a handicapped student's integration into the mainstream.
2. The special education teacher should have the primary responsibility of introducing the handicapped student to the new educational environment and new achievement expectations.

3. Handicapped and nonhandicapped students must understand that all people vary in their abilities, capacities, and talents.
4. Nonhandicapped students should participate in an orientation program which stresses awareness of the special problems of, and acceptance of, the handicapped.

XI. Student Assessment Factors

1. The system for reporting pupil progress should be detailed, specific, and flexible enough to insure that each child's progress is reported on an individual rather than a comparative basis.
2. Student behavioral and academic progress should be measured by the degree to which the individualized goals and objectives were achieved.
3. The progress of the handicapped student in the regular classroom should be compared to his preintegration performance and behavior.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to survey educators involved in mainstreaming handicapped children into the regular classroom as to what they perceived as the factors of a successful elementary school mainstreaming program.

The sample of educators included in this study was of a limited nature. It was obtained from educators in elementary school districts located in Cook County, Illinois, outside the City of Chicago.

The hypothesis was that interested parties in Cook County, Illinois, outside the City of Chicago, would be able to determine the factors required for a successful elementary school mainstreaming program.

The sample consisted of 95 educators; 40 receiving the first questionnaire, 40 receiving the second, and 15 taking part in the feasibility study. Recipients of the questionnaires and the feasibility study were chosen by lot from lists provided by the Superintendent of the Educational Service Region of Cook County, Illinois. From the sample population surveyed, 72.7% responded.

Content validity of the instrument was established in a two-fold manner. First, the questionnaire was

reviewed by experts in the field of special education. Based on their comments, modifications were made. Second, the questionnaire was sent to 40 educators currently involved with special education programs. Means and standard deviations of their responses on the Likert-type scale were tabulated. Six items with mean response scores of less than 3.0 were not included in the second questionnaire.

Questionnaire Two was sent to 40 educators to determine which factors would be included in the model mainstreaming program for the elementary school. Two items with mean response scores of less than 3.0 were not included in the final version of the model.

The factors comprising the model were grouped into categories and sent to 15 administrators as part of the feasibility study. Two additional items, teacher orientation time, and student orientation time, were added to the success factors determined by the questionnaires. They evolved from a study of the literature.

The administrators were asked to judge the feasibility of the model both in general and specifically for their school. The mean scores of their responses indicated they regarded the sections dealing with student orientation time (Item I: In General, 2.8; Specifically, 2.6) and

teacher orientation time (Item II: In General, 2.9; Specifically, 2.4) to be somewhat unfeasible.

All the factors which evolved from the questionnaires were, in general, considered to be very feasible or feasible by the respondents. One section (Item V; Specifically, 2.9) was thought to be somewhat unfeasible for their school although, in general, they thought it to be feasible.

Conclusions

1. Interested parties in Cook County, Illinois, outside the City of Chicago, were able to determine the factors of a successful mainstreaming program for the elementary school. All the factors generated by the two survey instruments were seen as essential factors of a model mainstreaming program.
2. The interested parties did not agree with the literature as to the length of teacher and student orientation time prior to the initiation of the mainstreaming program.
3. The high rate of return (72.6%) of the questionnaires indicated the topic of the study was considered to be both vital and germane to the interests of the respondents.
4. It is incumbent upon school districts to plan for administrative and programmatic changes such as those necessitated by the mainstreaming of handicapped students.

As a result of the review of the literature and implementing this study, several directions for further research have been identified.

Recommendations

1. A replication of this study in other parts of the country would add to the validity of the model.
2. A replication of the feasibility study with district level administrators would be informative.
3. The key role played by special education personnel in carrying out program activities lends itself to further investigation. Of particular interest would be the role of special education personnel as change agents, as the initiation of the concept of mainstreaming handicapped students affects the total educational program and the curriculum specifically.
4. A longitudinal study relative to the long range effects of mainstreaming on later life achievement would seem appropriate.
5. The effect of mainstreamed handicapped students on their nonhandicapped peers bears further investigation.
6. A study of successful mainstreaming programs to determine if there is positive correlation between the success of the program and the extent to which characteristics identified in the model are actualized. Conversely, an

investigation of mainstreaming programs which have failed to achieve success (to the degree that the programs have been discontinued) should also be undertaken.

7. A comparison of regular and special education teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming with those of the general public, and subgroups within the general public, would be informative. Subgroups would include low, middle, and high socioeconomic groups as well as the various ethnic groups found in a large metropolitan area.
8. The optimum number of handicapped students to be assigned to the same regular classroom should be researched.
9. The impact of various types of inservice training for regular classroom teachers who will be working with handicapped students needs further clarification.
10. Comparison of the effectiveness of team teaching, involving teams of regular and special education teachers vs. regular classroom teachers who have been inserviced, should provide the administrator with programming options.
11. In recent years many teacher training institutions have changed their curriculum to include additional courses dealing with handicapped students. A comparison of attitudes of graduates of those institutions with

the attitudes of graduates of institutions not providing such courses would be useful.

REFERENCES

- Algozzine, B., Mercer, C.D., & Counterline, T. (1977). "The Effects of the Labels and Behavior on Teacher Expectations." Exceptional Children, 44, 131-132.
- Ascione, F.R., & Borg, W.R. (1980). "Effects of a Training Program on Teacher Behavior and Handicapped Handicapped Children's Self-Concepts." The Journal of Psychology, 104, 53-65.
- Ballard, M., et al. (1977). "Improving the Social Status of Mainstreamed Retarded Children." Journal of Educational Psychology, 69, 605-611.
- Berdine, W., Knowlton, E., Malpass, P., & Ceglka, P. (1978). "The Conference Workshop: Inservice Considerations for Professional Educators." Exceptional Children, 45, 49-51.
- Birch, J. (1974). Mainstreaming: Educable Mentally Retarded Children in Regular Classes, Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Blacher-Dixon, J. (1979). Preschool Mainstreaming: Current State of the Art. U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, Eric Document ED 171 087.
- Bloom, B. (1971) Mastery Learning: Theory and Practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Blumberg, L. (1973). "The Case for Integrated Schooling." The Exceptional Parent, 3(4), 15-17.

- Boersman, F., et al. (1979). "Academic Self-Concept Change in Special Education Students." Journal of Special Education, 13, 433-442.
- Brown v. Topeka Board of Education. 347 U.S. 483.
- Cantrell, R., & Cantrell, M. (1976). "Preventive Mainstreaming: Impact of a Supportive Services Program on Pupils." Exceptional Children, 42, 381-386.
- Cantrell, R., Stenner, J., & Katzenmeyer, W. (1977). "Teacher Attitudes and Classroom Teaching Correlates of Student Achievement." Journal of Educational Psychology, 69, 506-510.
- Carlberg, C., & Kavale, K. (1980). "The Efficacy of Special Versus Regular Class Placement for Exceptional Children: A Mega Analysis." Journal of Special Education, 14, 295-309.
- Chaffin, J. (1974). "Will the Real 'Mainstreaming' Program Please Stand Up!" Focus on Exceptional Education, 6(5), 1-19.
- Chenault, M. (1967). "Improving the Social Acceptance of Unpopular Educable Mentally Retarded Pupils in Special Classes." American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 72, 455-458.
- Children's Defense Fund. (1976). Your Rights Under the Education for All Handicapped Children Act P.L. 94-142. Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund.

- Christopherson, J. (1972). "The Special Child in the 'Regular' Preschool: Some Administrative Notes." Childhood Education, 49(3), 138-140.
- Christopolos, F. (1973). "Keeping Exceptional Children in Regular Classes." Exceptional Children, 39, 569-572.
- Combs, R., & Harper, J. (1967). "Effects of Labels on Attitudes of Educators Toward Handicapped Children." Exceptional Children, 33, 399-403.
- Cook, J., & Wollersheim, J. (1976). "The Effect of Labeling of Special Education Students on the Perceptions of Contact Versus Noncontact Normal Peers." The Journal of Special Education, 10, 187-198.
- Cruickshank, W., & Johnson, G. (Eds.), (1975). Education of Exceptional Children and Youth. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Davis, W. (1975). Experimental Program for the Improvement of Teacher Competency in Reading: A Comparison Between Remedial Reading Classroom Instruction and Specialized Remedial Reading Instruction Outside of the Regular Classroom. U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 117 656.
- Demers, L.A. (1981). "Effective Mainstreaming for the Learning Disabled Student with Behavior Problems." Journal of Learning Disabilities, 14, 179-188, 203.

- Des Jardins, C., & Hull, R. (1976). Rights Handbook for Handicapped Children and Adults. A joint project of: Co-ordinating Council for Handicapped Children and Governor's Committee On The Handicapped. Chicago.
- Deutch, M. (1962). "Cooperation and Trust: Some Theoretical Notes." Jones, M. (ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. University of Nebraska Press, 275-320.
- Diana v. California State Board of Education. Civil No. C-70-37, RFP N.D. Calif. (Feb. 5, 1970).
- Dunn, L. (1968). "Special Education for the Mildly Retarded - Is Much of It Justified?" Exceptional Children, 35, 5-22.
- Eddington, R.E. (1975). "SLD Children: A Ten-Year Follow-Up." Academic Therapy, 11, 53-64.
- Edelfelt, R., & Johnson, M., (eds.). (1975). Rethinking Inservice Education. Washington: National Education Association.
- "Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142)."
- Edwards, L.L., (1980). "Curriculum Modification as a Strategy for Helping Regular Classroom Behavior Disordered." Focus on Exceptional Children, 12, 1-11.
- Enos, D.F. (1976). Meeting Children's Needs: A Field Centered Curriculum for Mainstreaming. U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 126 638.

- Evans, S. (1980). "The Consultant Role of the Resource Teacher." Exceptional Children, 46, 402-404.
- Fallis, J., (1975). "The Key to Integrated Learning for Children Who are Hearing Impaired." The Volta Review, 77(6), 363-367.
- Fine, M. (1967). "Attitudes of Regular and Special Class Teachers Toward the Educable Mentally Retarded." Exceptional Children, 33, 429-430.
- Flynn, J., Gacka, R., & Sundean, D. (1978). Opinions of Educators Toward the Mainstreaming of Handicapped Students. Edinboro, Pennsylvania: Project Mainstream, Edinboro State College.
- Foster, G. & Keech, V. (1977). "Teacher Reactions to the Label of Educable Mentally Retarded." Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 12, 307-311.
- Foster, G., & Salvia, J. (1977). "Teacher Response to Label of Learning Disabled as a Function of Demand Characteristics." Exceptional Children, 43, 533-534.
- Fuchigami, R. & Shepherd, G. (1968). "Factors Affecting the Integration of Educable Mentally Retarded Students." Mental Retardation, 6(4), 18-22.
- Fulton, S.C. (1976). "The Effects of a Special Education Competency Based Teacher Education Program on Teacher Effectiveness and Pupil Achievement." Doctoral Dissertation, East Texas State University.

- Gable, R., Strain, P., & Hendrickson, J. (1979).
"Strategies for Improving the Status and Social Behavior
of Learning Disabled Children." Learning Disability
Quarterly, 2, 33-39.
- Gargiulo, R. (1980). "Litigation and Legislation for
Exceptional Children: An Historical Perspective."
Illinois Council for Exceptional Children Quarterly,
29, 2-13.
- Gerber, S., & Drezed, S. (1977). "Teacher Education."
Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 12, 75-82.
- Gillung, T., & Rucker, C. (1977). "Lables and Teacher
Expectations." Exceptional Children, 43, 464-465.
- Glass, R. (1973). "Doing Special Education versus Being
a Special Educator." Viewpoints, 49, 51-71.
- Glass, R., & Meckler, R. (1972). "Preparing Elementary
Teachers to Instruct Mildly Handicapped Children in
Regular Classrooms: A Summer Workshop." Exceptional
Children, 39, 152-156.
- Glasser, W. (1965). Reality Therapy. N.Y.: Harper & Row.
- Glasser, W. (1969). Schools Without Failure. New York:
Harper & Row.
- Glick, H., & Schubert, M. (1981). "Mainstreaming: An
Unmandated Challenge." Educational Leadership, 38,
326-329.

- Gliedman, J. & Roth, W. (1980). The Unexpected Minority: Handicapped Children in America. New York: Carnegie Council on Children.
- Good, T., & Brouphy, J. (1972). "Behavioral Expression of Teacher Attitudes." Journal of Educational Psychology, 63, 617-624.
- Gottlieb, J., Agard, J. Kaufman, N., & Semmel, M. (1976). "Retarded Children Mainstreamed: Practices as They Affect Minority Children." Mainstreaming and the Minority Child. Jones, R.L. (ed.). Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Gottlieb, J., Semmel, M., & Veldman, D. (1978). "Correlates of Social Status Among Mainstreamed Mentally Retarded Children." Journal of Educational Psychology, 70, 396-405.
- Graham, S., et al. (1980). "Educational Personnel's Perception of Mainstreaming and Resource Room Effectiveness." Psychology in the Schools, 17, 129-134.
- Grosenick, J. (1970). "Assessing the Re-Integration of Exceptional Children Into Regular Classes." Teaching Exceptional Children, 2(3), 113-119.
- Grosenick, J. (1974). "Integration of Exceptional Children Into Regular Classes: Research and Procedure." Jones, R.L. (ed.). Special Education in Transition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Haber, A., & Runyon, R. (1969). General Statistics.
Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Pub. Company.
- Haisley, F.B., Tell, C.A. & Andrews, J. (1981). "Peers
as Tutors in the Mainstream: Trained 'Teachers' of
Handicapped Adolescents." Journal of Learning Disabilities,
14, 224-226.
- Hale, S., Prothro, E.H., & George, J. (1976). Project
S.E.R.T. - Special Education for Regular Teachers.
U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC
Document ED 122 479.
- Harasymiw, S., & Horne, M. (1976). "Teacher Attitudes
Toward Handicapped Children and Regular Class
Integration." Journal of Special Education, 10, 393-400.
- Haring, W. (1976). "Integrated Education." The Volta
Review, 78(4), 68-75.
- Haring, N., & Krug, D. (1975). "Placement in Regular
Programs: Procedures and Results." Exceptional
Children, 41, 413-417.
- Hartwel, L.K., Wiseman, D.E., & Van Reusen, A. (1979).
"Modifying Course Content for Mildly Handicapped
Students at the Secondary Level." Teaching Exceptional
Children, 28-32.
- Hayes, J., & Higgins, S. (1978). "Issues Regarding the IEP:
Teachers on the Front Line." Exceptional Children, 44,
267-272.

- Healey, W. (1976). "Integrated Education." The Volta Review, 78(4), 68-75.
- Helge, D. (1981). "Problems in Implementing Comprehensive Special Education Programming in Rural Areas." Exceptional Children, 47, 516-517.
- Heron, T. (1978). "Maintaining the Mainstreamed Child in the Regular Classroom: the Decision-Making Process." Journal of Learning Disabilities, 11, 251-256.
- Higgs, R. (1975). "Attitude Formation - Contact or Information." Exceptional Children, 41, 496-497.
- Houck, C., & Sherman, A. (1979). "Mainstreaming Current Flows Two Ways." Academic Therapy, 15, 133-140.
- Hudson, R., Graham, S., & Warner, M. (1979). "Mainstreaming: An Examination of the Attitudes and Needs of Regular Classroom Teachers." Learning Disability Quarterly, 2, 58-62.
- Hunt, D. (1975). "Person-Environment Interaction: A Challenge Found Wanting Before it was Tried." Review of Educational Research, 42, 209-230.
- Iano, R., Ayers, D., Heller, H., McGettigan, H., & Warner, J. (1974). "Sociometric Status of Retarded Children in an Integration Program." Exceptional Children, 40, 267-271.
- Illinois Education Office. (May, 1978). Learning Disabilities Manual: Recommended Procedures and Practices. (Prepared by Pysh, M., & Chalfant, J.). Springfield, Illinois.

- Ito, R.H. (1981). "After the Resource Room - Then What?" Academic Therapy, 16, 283-287.
- Johnson, A.B., & Cartwright, C.A. (1979). "The Roles of Information and Experience in Improving Teachers' Knowledge and Attitudes About Mainstreaming." The Journal of Special Education, 13, 453-461.
- Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (1980). "Integrating Handicapped Students into the Mainstream." Exceptional Children, 47, 90.
- Johnson, D.W. et al. (1978). Learning Together and Alone: Cooperation, Competition, and Individualization. Minneapolis: Leadership Training Institute/Special Education, University of Minnesota.
- Jones, R., Gottfried, N. & Owens, A. (1966). "Social Distance of the Exceptional: A Study at the High School Level." Exceptional Children, 32, 551-556.
- Jones, R. (1974). "The Hierarchical Structure of Attitudes Toward the Exceptional." Exceptional Children, 40, 430-435.
- Jones, T.W., et al. (1981). "Changing Children's Perceptions of Handicapped People." Exceptional Children, 47, 365-368.

- Jordon, J., & Proctor, D. (1969). "Relationships Between Knowledge of Exceptional Children, Kind and Amount of Experience With Them, and Teacher Attitude Toward their Integration." The Journal of Special Education, 3, 433-439.
- Kaufman, N., Gottlieb, J., Agard, J., & Kukia, M. (1975). "Mainstreaming Toward an Explication of the Construct." Focus on Exceptional Children, 7, 4-9.
- Kelly, T., Bullock, L., & Dykes, K. (1977). "Behavioral Disorders: Teachers' Perceptions." Exceptional Children, 43, 316-318.
- Keogh, B., & Levitt, M. (1979). "Special Education in the Mainstream: A Confrontation of Limitations?" pp.406-423.
- Meyen, E., Vergason, G., & Whelan, R. (eds.), Instructional Planning for Exceptional Children. Denver, Colorado: Love Publishing.
- Kirk, S. (1964). "Research in Education." Mental Retardation. Stevens, H. A. & Heber, R. (eds.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kurtzman, D., et al., Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Civil Action No. 71-42, Order, Injunction, and Consent Agreement, October 7, 1971.

- LaGreca, A., & Mesibov, G. (1979). "Social Skills Intervention with Learning-Disabled Children." Clinical Child Psychology, 8, 234-241.
- LaGreca, A., & Mesibov, G. (1981). "Facilitating Interpersonal Functioning With Peers in Learning Disabled Children." Journal of Learning Disabilities, 14, 197-199, 238.
- Larrivee, B. (1981). "Effects of Inservice Training Intensity on Teachers' Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming." Exceptional Children, 48, 34-39.
- Lawrence, G. (1974). Patterns of Effective Inservice Education: Guidelines for Developing a Competency Based Inservice Education Program. Tallahassee, Fl.: Florida Department of Education.
- Leckie, D. (1973). "Creating a Positive Climate in the Mainstream Program." The Volta Review, 75, 23-27.
- Lerner, J. (1976). "Emerging Directions in Learning Disabilities." Children with Learning Disabilities, 36-37.
- Lerner, J. (1981). Learning Disabilities: Theories, Diagnosis, and Teaching Strategies. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Little, T. (Oct. 1976). Preparation of Special Education Instructional and Non-Instructional Support Personnel

- in the Consultation Process. Paper presented at the Least Restrictive Alternative Conference, Des Moines, Iowa.
- Litton, F., Banbury, M., & Harris, K. (1980). "Materials for Educating Nonhandicapped Students About Their Handicapped Peers." Teaching Exceptional Children, 13, 39.
- Lynch, W. (1977). "Training Educational Personnel Under the New Law: Prospects and Problems." Viewpoints in Teaching and Learning, 53, 73-87.
- Marandola, P., & Imber, S. (1979). "Glasser's Classroom Meeting." Journal of Learning Disabilities, 12, 383-387.
- Markus, E. (1980). "Mapping the Social Structure of a Class: A Practical Instrument for Assessing Some Effects of Mainstreaming." Journal of Special Education, 14, (N3), 311-321.
- Martin, E. (1975). "Mainstream Education Training and the Federal Government." Handicapped Youth and the Mainstream Educator, Minneapolis, Minn.: Audio Visual Library Service.
- McHale, S., et al. (1981). "Nonhandicapped Children as Tutors for Autistic Children." Exceptional Children, 48, 263-264.
- Meyerowitz, J.H. (1967). "Self - derogations in Young

- Retardates and Special Class Placement." Child Development, 33, 443-541.
- Meyerowitz, J.H. (1967). "Peer Groups and Special Classes." Mental Retardation, 5(5), 23-26.
- Miller, J. (1973). Helping Your Young Child at Home. San Rafael, Ca.: Academic Therapy Publications.
- Miller, T.L. & Sabatino, D.A. (1978). "An Evaluation of the Teacher Consultant Model as an Approach to Mainstreaming." Exceptional Children, 45, 86-91.
- Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia. No. 1939-71. (D.D.C. 1971).
- Molloy, L. (1975). "The Changing Mandate for Special Education." Education Digest, 40, 7: 6-9.
- Monroe, J., & Howe, C. (1971). "The Effects of Integration and Social Class on the Acceptance of Retarded Adolescents." Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 6, 20-24.
- National Association of State Directors of Special Education. (1976). The Prince William Model: Planning Guide for the Development and Implementation of Full Service for all Handicapped Children. Washington, D.C.
- Nielsen, L. (1979). "An In-Service Program for Secondary Learning Disabilities Teachers." Journal of Learning Disabilities, 12, 70-74.

- Parisi, P., et al. Plaintiff's Brief March 17, 1972.
U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York.
- Parten, M. (1966). Surveys, Polls, and Samples: Practical Procedures. New York: Cooper Square Publishers.
- Pasternak, S. (1979). "An Exploratory Study of Successful Mainstreaming Program Characteristics." Dissertation Abstract International, 41/09, p.3989A, No. 8105537.
- Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. 334 F. Supp.1257(ED 1971).
- Porter, G. (1975). "The Missing Vital Dimension in Successful Integration." The Volta Review, 77, 417-422.
- Public Law 94-142 (1975), 20 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.
- Public Law 93-112, Section 504 (1973), 29 U.S.C. 794.
- Purdy, J.D. (1981). "Promoting School Acceptance of Handicapped Students Through Organizational Development." The Pointer, 25, 11-13.
- Redden, M., & Blackhurst, A. (1978). "Mainstreaming Competency Specifications for Elementary Teachers." Exceptional Children, 44, 615-617.
- Reger, R. (1973). "What Is a Resource Room Program?" Journal of Learning Disabilities, 6, 609-614.
- Reger, R. (1979). "Learning Disabilities: Futile Attempts at a Simplistic Definition." Journal of Learning Disabilities, 12, 529-532.
- Rich, C., Hambleton, D., & Klein, B. (1975). The Integration of Hearing Impaired Children in Regular Classrooms. U.S. Educational Center, ERIC Document ED 133 937.

- Reynolds, M. (Oct.28,1974). "Educating Exceptional Children in Regular Classes." Paper presented at the Leadership Training Institute, University of Minnesota.
- Reynolds, M., & Birch, J. (1977). Teaching Exceptional Children in All America's Schools: A First Course For Teachers and Principals. Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Ringlaben, R., & Price, J. (1981). "Regular Classroom Teachers' Perceptions of Mainstreaming Effects." Exceptional Children, 47, 302-304.
- Ritter, D.R. (1978). "Surviving in the Regular Classroom: A Follow-Up of Mainstreamed Children with Learning Disabilities." Journal of School Psychology, 16, 253-256.
- Rosenthal, R. & Jacobsen, L. (1968). Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Rude, C. (1978). "Trends and Priorities in Inservice Training." Exceptional Children, 45, 1 72-176.
- Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education. (1976). State Board of Education, Illinois Office of Education. Chicago.
- Rust, J.O., Miller, L.S., & Wilson, W.H. (1978). "Using a Control Group to Evaluate a Resource Room Program." Psychology in the Schools, 15, 503-506.
- Ryor, J. (1978). "94-142 - The Perspective of Regular Educators." Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 1, 7-14.

- Sabatino, D.A. (1971). "An Evaluation of Resource Rooms for Children with Learning Disabilities." Journal of Learning Disabilities, 4, 84-93.
- Sarason, S.B. (1978). "Mainstreaming: Dilemmas, Opposition, Opportunities." Futures of Education for Exceptional Students: Emerging Structures, ed. Maynard Reynolds. Minneapolis: National Support Systems Project.
- Schubert, M.A., & Glick, H.M. (1981). "Least Restrictive Environment Programs: Why Are Some So Successful?" Education Unlimited, 3, 11-13.
- Schmelkin, L.P. (1981). "Teachers' and Nonteachers' Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming." Exceptional Children, 48, 42-47.
- Semmel, M., Gottlieb, J. & Robinson, N. (1979). "Mainstreaming: Perspectives on Educating Handicapped Children in the Public Schools." Review of Research in Education, Berliner, D.C. (ed.). Itasca, Il. F.E. Peacock, 223-278.
- Shaver, J. & Curtis, C. (1980). "Another Challenge for Social Studies." Social Education, 45, 208-211.
- Siegel, E. (1969). Special Education in the Regular Classroom. New York: John Day Company.
- Simon, S. et al. (1972). Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students. New York: Hart Publishing Company.

- Simon, S., & O'Rourke, R. (1977). Developing Values with Exceptional Children. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Sivage, C.A. (1980). "The Organizational Context of Mainstreaming." The Directive Teacher, 2, 16-17.
- Sivage, C.R. (1982). "Implementing Public Law 94-142: A Case for Organizational Readiness." The Journal for Special Educators, 8, 29-40.
- Smart, R., Wilton, K. & Keeling, B. (1980). "Teacher Factors and Special Class Placement." Journal of Special Education, 14(2), 217-229.
- Stephens, T. & Braun, B. (1980). "Measure of Regular Classroom Teachers' Attitudes Toward Handicapped Children." Exceptional Children, 46, 292-294.
- Sterns, M. & Cooperstein, R. (1981). "Equity in Educating the Handicapped." Educational Leadership, 38, 324-325.
- Tarrier, R. B. (1978). Mainstreamed Handicapped Students in Occupational Education: Exemplary Administrative Practices. U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 154 163.
- Tice, W., Chairman. (1976) Mainstreaming: Helping Teachers Meet the Challenge. Washington, D.C.: National Council in Education Professions Development.
- Thornberg, J. (1980). "Into the Mainstream." Contemporary Education, 51, 161.

- Turnbull, A., & Schultz, J. (1979). Mainstreaming Handicapped Students. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tutalo, A. J. (1975). Staff Development Program. Maxi 1 Practicum. U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 119 451.
- Wade, D.O. & Knight, M.F. (1976). Applying Behavioral and Political Principles in Developing Mainstream Special Education Programs. U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 136 517.
- Waggoner, L.G. (1978). "Effects of an Inservice Training Model for Mainstream Teachers on Factors Regarding Exceptional Children." Doctoral Dissertation, Texas Tech University.
- Walker, V.S. (1974). "The Efficacy of the Resource Room for Educating Retarded Children." Exceptional Children, 40, 288-289.
- Warner, F., Tharp, R., & Walsh, S. (1973). "Attitudes of Children Toward Their Special Class Placement." Exceptional Children, 40, 37-38.
- Weckler, E., & Youngberg, M. (1975). IMPACT: Mainstreaming Learning Problems in the Classroom. Part I: In Classroom. Part II: Dissemination at University. U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 112 559.

- Wiederholt, J.L., Hammill, D.D., & Brown, V. (1978).
The Resource Teacher: A Guide to Effective Practices.
Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wetter, J. (1972). "Parent Attitudes Toward Learning
Disability." Exceptional Children, 38, 490-491.
- Wilkes, H. et al. (1979). "Criteria for Mainstreaming
the Learning Disabled Child into the Regular
Classroom." Journal of Learning Disabilities, 12,
251-256.
- Williams, R., & Algozzine, B. (1979). "Teachers' Attitudes
Toward Mainstreaming." Elementary School Journal, 80,
(11), 63-69.
- Witherell, C., & Erickson, J. (1978). "Teacher Education
as Adult Development," Theory into Practice, 17, 229-238.
- Woodward, J. (1980). "Peer Acceptance for the Handicapped."
Phi Delta Kappan, 61, 715.
- Wayatt, R. versus Stickney, S., et al., Plaintiff's Brief,
March 2, 1972, U.S. District Court Middle District of
Alabama, Northern Division, Civil Action. No.3195-N.
- Ziegler, S., & Hambleton, D. (1976). "Integration of
Young TMR Children Into a Regular Elementary School."
Exceptional Children, 42, 459-461.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER FOR QUESTIONNAIRES ONE AND TWO
AND FOLLOW-UP LETTER FOR QUESTIONNAIRE ONE

School of Education
Human Services and
Counseling

2235 North Sheffield Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60614

(312) 321-8110

Dear Educator:

Since the passage of P.L. 94-142, increasing numbers of handicapped students have been mainstreamed into the regular classroom. The success of a mainstreaming program depends on a clear understanding of all parties involved as to what are the stated purposes and goals of the program.

The accompanying questionnaire is part of a master's project being conducted at DePaul University and is an attempt to establish what those characteristics are that would yield a successful mainstreaming effort. Hopefully the results of the study will provide direction for others engaged in similar endeavors.

I realize your schedule is busy, but hope you or a member of your staff who is involved in the mainstreaming of handicapped students will be able to take the time to complete the questionnaire. Your assistance is vital to the success of the study. An addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the completed questionnaire. If you are interested in the results of the study, please so indicate by checking the appropriate place on the questionnaire and I will be happy to send you a summary of the results. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Norbert T. Bunish
Norbert T. Bunish

Dear Educator:

The end of the school year is almost upon us and soon many staff members will scatter for the summer in search of rest and/or individual pursuits. I plan to use the summer to record and analyze the data needed to complete the study of the elements of a successful mainstreaming program.

I need your assistance. A high rate of response is essential to the success of the study. The questionnaire I sent may have been mislaid so I have included another for your convenience. Your participation will make a difference. It will insure that the many long hours of work on the study will have been well-spent. If you wish to have a copy of the results, please check the appropriate spot on the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Norbert T. Bunish
Norbert T. Bunish

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE ONE

QUESTIONNAIRE

Name _____ School _____

Address _____

Number of years in regular education _____ special education _____

Check position currently held:

Principal _____ Assistant Principal _____ Guidance Director _____

Counselor _____ Classroom Teacher _____ Special Ed. Supervisor _____

Special Education _____ Other _____

Summary of results: Yes _____ No _____

The following items are representative of possible characteristics of successful mainstreaming programs. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree each item is essential by marking the continuum.

	Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
1. Parents and interested parties in the community should be familiar with P.L. 94-142 and the ways it will affect the educational programs of the school.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Parents and interested parties in the community should be familiarized with various types of handicaps and their characteristics to help minimize negative stereotypes of handicapped students.	5	4	3	2	1
3. All administrators involved in a mainstreaming program should have a thorough understanding of Public Law 94-142 (Education for All Handicapped Children Act).	5	4	3	2	1
4. School administrators should participate in orientation programs to prepare them to understand the special problems associated with establishing mainstreaming programs and to acquire the leadership skills needed to maintain the programs.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Parents of "regular" and special education students attending the school should be involved in developing the mainstreaming program.	5	4	3	2	1
6. The process of mainstreaming handicapped students necessitates a climate exemplified by a positive attitude exhibited by administrators.	5	4	3	2	1
7. Local school administrators should be aware of the resources (both in and out of the school district) that would be available to them to provide appropriate instruction for handicapped students.	5	4	3	2	1
8. Special education programs should be administratively decentralized with the building principal having total responsibility to implement the concept of mainstreaming.	5	4	3	2	1
9. The building principal should have the autonomy and flexibility to modify curriculum to meet the unique needs of each handicapped student.	5	4	3	2	1

	Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
10. All educational personnel involved in a mainstreaming program should have a thorough understanding of Public Law 94-142.	5	4	3	2	1
11. All educational personnel should be aware of their rights in mainstreaming.	5	4	3	2	1
12. The school district should provide support personnel who will function as a team to aid the regular classroom teacher and mainstreamed students.	5	4	3	2	1
13. Special education personnel should be certified by the state education agency in at least one area of special education as defined by the state education agency.	5	4	3	2	1
14. There should be a careful definition of roles and responsibilities of all personnel.	5	4	3	2	1
15. The number of handicapped children in a regular classroom should not exceed 10% of the enrollment.	5	4	3	2	1
16. Regular classroom teachers should observe special education teachers working with handicapped children before the handicapped children are mainstreamed into the regular classroom.	5	4	3	2	1
17. The planning phase of a mainstreaming program should include the participation of all educational personnel in a needs assessment.	5	4	3	2	1
18. Teachers perceptions of, and attitudes toward, mainstreamed students must be positive.	5	4	3	2	1
19. Adult volunteers should be used as teacher aides to reinforce and supplement classroom activities.	5	4	3	2	1
20. Teachers should use "regular" students as teacher aides to reinforce and supplement classroom activities.	5	4	3	2	1
21. The teaching staff should have the autonomy and flexibility to modify curriculum to meet the unique needs of each handicapped student.	5	4	3	2	1

	Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
22. Regular classroom teachers should modify instructional materials and adjust their teaching methods to accomodate handicapped students.					
23. The matching of students and teachers should be based on the compatability of their respective teaching and learning styles.	5	4	3	2	1
24. All educational personnel should be aware of the resources (both in and out of the school district) which are available to them to provide appropriate instruction for handicapped students.	5	4	3	2	1
25. Close communication between the regular and special education teacher is necessary during the period of initial integration into the mainstream.	5	4	3	2	1
26. Special education teachers must be able to convey special education diagnostic and instructional procedures and techniques to the regular teacher.	5	4	3	2	1
27. Whenever possible, students should be involved in the planning for any program they will participate in.	5	4	3	2	1
28. Educational assessment and diagnostic teaching should be emphasized.	5	4	3	2	1
29. The classroom teacher has the prime responsibility of communicating with parents of handicapped students in the mainstreaming program.	5	4	3	2	1
30. Regular classroom teachers should provide natural opportunities for the handicapped student to achieve success and high status.	5	4	3	2	1
31. The general atmosphere of the classroom must be one in which there is general acceptance of all youngsters.	5	4	3	2	1
32. Non-academic talents of the handicapped should be developed as a means of increasing peer acceptance.	5	4	3	2	1

	Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
33. The special education teacher should have the primary responsibility to determine the psychological and educational readiness for a handicapped student's integration into the mainstream.					
34. The special education teacher should have the primary responsibility of introducing the handicapped student to the new educational environment and new achievement expectations.	5	4	3	2	1
35. Structured opportunities are provided to enable handicapped and non-handicapped students to discover similarities between themselves.	5	4	3	2	1
36. Handicapped and non-handicapped students must understand that all people vary in their abilities, capacities, and talents.	5	4	3	2	1
37. Non-handicapped students should participate in an orientation program which stresses awareness of the special problems of and acceptance of handicapped people.	5	4	3	2	1
38. Overt rejection of handicapped students must be dealt with openly.	5	4	3	2	1
39. Unacceptable behavior by handicapped students must not be tolerated.	5	4	3	2	1
40. It is the responsibility of the administration to provide formal and/or informal inservice for the "regular" classroom teacher.	5	4	3	2	1
41. It is the responsibility of the special education teachers and ancillary personnel to provide formal and/or informal inservice for the "regular" teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
42. The use of individual and group assessment materials and techniques should be part of an inservice program.	5	4	3	2	1
43. Inservice programs should be jointly planned by local administrators and teachers.	5	4	3	2	1

	Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
44. Inservice programs should be conducted by local school personnel.	5	4	3	2	1
45. Inservice programs should include demonstrations and hands-on activities.	5	4	3	2	1
46. Inservice programs should attend to teachers' attitudes about mainstreaming.	5	4	3	2	1
47. Behavior modification should be part of the inservice program.	5	4	3	2	1
48. Inservice programs should be of long-term duration.	5	4	3	2	1
49. The system for reporting pupil progress should be detailed, specific, and flexible enough to insure that each child's progress is reported on an individual rather than a comparative basis.	5	4	3	2	1
50. Student behavioral and academic progress should be measured by the degree to which the individualized goals and objectives were achieved.	5	4	3	2	1
51. The progress of the handicapped student in the regular classroom should be compared to his pre-integration performance and behavior.	5	4	3	2	1
52. Communication with parents of handicapped children should be a shared responsibility of the classroom teacher, special education personnel, and the building principal.	5	4	3	2	1
53. A continuing information and education system should be developed which will furnish data to parents of the handicapped, administrators, and others involved in the program so that progress can be assessed and new goals set.	5	4	3	2	1

Please list any characteristics of a successful mainstreaming program which may have been omitted from the above listing.

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE TWO

QUESTIONNAIRE

Name _____ School _____

Address _____

Number of years in regular education _____ special education _____

Check position currently held:

Principal _____ Assistant Principal _____ Guidance Director _____

Counselor _____ Classroom Teacher _____ Special Ed. Supervisor _____

Special Education _____ Other _____

Summary of results: Yes _____ No _____

The following items are representative of possible characteristics of successful mainstreaming programs. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree each item is essential by marking the continuum.

	Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
1. Parents and interested parties in the community should be familiar with PL 94-142 and the ways it will affect the educational programs of the school.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Parents and interested parties in the community should be familiarized with various types of handicaps and their characteristics to help minimize negative stereotypes of handicapped students.	5	4	3	2	1
3. All administrators involved in a mainstreaming program should have a thorough understanding of Public Law 94-142 (Education for All Handicapped Children Act).	5	4	3	2	1
4. School administrators should participate in orientation programs to prepare them to understand the special problems associated with establishing mainstreaming programs and to acquire the leadership skills needed to maintain the programs.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Parents of "regular" and special education students attending the school should be involved in developing the mainstreaming program.	5	4	3	2	1
6. The process of mainstreaming handicapped students necessitates a climate exemplified by a positive attitude exhibited by administrators.	5	4	3	2	1
7. Local school administrators should be aware of the resources(both in and out of the school district) that would be available to them to provide appropriate instruction for handicapped students.	5	4	3	2	1
8. Special education programs should be administratively decentralized with the building principal having total responsibility to implement the concept of mainstreaming.	5	4	3	2	1
9. The building principal should have the autonomy and flexibility to modify curriculum to meet the unique needs of each handicapped student.	5	4	3	2	1
10. All educational personnel involved in a mainstreaming program should have a thorough understanding of PL 94-142.	5	4	3	2	1
11. All educational personnel should be aware of their rights in mainstreaming.	5	4	3	2	1
12. The school district should provide support personnel who will function as a team to aid the regular classroom teacher and mainstreamed students.	5	4	3	2	1

	Extremely Important 5	Very Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1
13. Special education personnel should be certified by the state agency in at least one area of special education as defined by the state education agency.					
14. There should be a careful definition of roles and responsibilities of all personnel.	5	4	3	2	1
15. The number of handicapped children in a regular classroom should not exceed 10% of the enrollment.	5	4	3	2	1
16. Regular classroom teachers should observe special education teachers working with handicapped children before the handicapped children are mainstreamed into the regular classroom.	5	4	3	2	1
17. The planning phase of a mainstreaming program should include the participation of all educational personnel in a needs assessment.	5	4	3	2	1
18. Teachers' perceptions of, and attitudes toward, mainstreamed students must be positive.	5	4	3	2	1
19. The teaching staff should have the autonomy and flexibility to modify curriculum to meet the unique needs of each handicapped student.	5	4	3	2	1
20. Regular classroom teachers should modify instructional materials and adjust their teaching methods to accommodate handicapped students.	5	4	3	2	1
21. The matching of students and teachers should be based on the compatibility of their respective teaching and learning styles.	5	4	3	2	1
22. All educational personnel should be aware of the resources (both in and out of the school district) which are available to them to help provide appropriate instruction for handicapped students.	5	4	3	2	1
23. Close communication between the regular and special education teacher is necessary during the period of initial integration into the mainstream.	5	4	3	2	1
24. Special education teachers must be able to convey special education diagnostic and instructional procedures and techniques to the regular teacher.	5	4	3	2	1
25. Educational assessment and diagnostic teaching should be emphasized.	5	4	3	2	1

	Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
26. Regular classroom teachers should provide natural opportunities for the handicapped student to achieve success and high status.	5	4	3	2	1
27. The general atmosphere of the classroom must be one in which there is general acceptance of all youngsters.	5	4	3	2	1
28. Non-academic talents of the handicapped should be developed as a means of increasing peer acceptance.	5	4	3	2	1
29. The Special education teacher should have the primary responsibility to determine the psychological and educational readiness for a handicapped student's integration into the mainstream.	5	4	3	2	1
30. The special education teacher should have the primary responsibility of introducing the handicapped student to the new educational environment and new achievement expectations.	5	4	3	2	1
31. Structured opportunities are provided to enable handicapped and nonhandicapped students to discover similarities between themselves.	5	4	3	2	1
32. Handicapped and non-handicapped students must understand that all people vary in their abilities, capacities, and talents.	5	4	3	2	1
33. Non-handicapped students should participate in an orientation program which stresses awareness of the special problems of and acceptance of the handicapped.	5	4	3	2	1
34. Overt rejection of handicapped students must be dealt with openly.	5	4	3	2	1
35. Unacceptable behavior by handicapped students must not be tolerated.	5	4	3	2	1
36. It is the responsibility of the administration to provide formal and/or informal inservice for the "regular" classroom teacher.	5	4	3	2	1
37. It is the responsibility of the special education teachers and ancillary personnel to provide formal and/or informal inservice for the "regular" teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
38. The use of individual and group assessment materials and techniques should be part of an inservice program.	5	4	3	2	1

	Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Unimportant
39. Inservice programs should be jointly planned by local administrators and teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
40. Inservice programs should include demonstrations and hands-on activities.	5	4	3	2	1
41. Inservice programs should attend to teachers' attitudes about mainstreaming.	5	4	3	2	1
42. Behavior modification should be part of the inservice program.	5	4	3	2	1
43. The system for reporting pupil progress should be detailed, specific, and flexible enough to insure that each child's progress is reported on an individual rather than a comparative basis.	5	4	3	2	1
44. Student behavioral and academic progress should be measured by the degree to which the individualized goals and objectives were achieved.	5	4	3	2	1
45. The progress of the handicapped student in the regular classroom should be compared to his preintegration performance and behavior.	5	4	3	2	1
46. Communication with parents of handicapped children should be a shared responsibility of the classroom teacher, special education personnel, and the building principal.	5	4	3	2	1
47. A continuing information and education system should be developed which will furnish data to parents of the handicapped, administrators, and others involved in the program so that the program can be assessed and new goals set.	5	4	3	2	1

Please list any characteristics of a successful mainstreaming program which may have been omitted from the above listing.

APPENDIX D

FEASIBILITY STUDY COVER LETTER

School of Education
Human Services and
Counseling

2235 North Sheffield Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60614

(312)321-8110

Dear Educator:

Since the passage of PL 94-142, increasing numbers of handicapped students have been mainstreamed into the regular classroom. The accompanying feasibility study is part of a master's project being conducted at DePaul University and is an attempt to determine the factors which yield a successful mainstreaming program.

Questionnaires were used to establish content validity and to construct the revised form of the model. The model consists of components which were considered valuable by experts (both administrators and teachers) currently involved with the mainstreaming of handicapped students.

We realize your time is at a premium, but hope that you will be willing to assist me in the final phase of the project by reviewing the model and completing the feasibility questionnaire. An addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the questionnaire. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Norbert T. Bunish
Norbert T. Bunish

APPENDIX E

FEASIBILITY QUESTIONNAIRE

FEASIBILITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Name _____ Position _____

School _____ District _____

Please indicate the degree to which the various factors are capable of being accomplished in general, and for your school.

		Extremely Feasible 5	Very Feasible 4	Feasible 3	Somewhat Unfeasible 2	Unfeasible 1
I. Student Orientation Time	In General	5	4	3	2	1
	For My School	5	4	3	2	1
Comments _____						

II. Teacher Orientation Time	In General	5	4	3	2	1
	For My School	5	4	3	2	1
Comments _____						

III. Ancillary Personnel Factors	In General	5	4	3	2	1
	For My School	5	4	3	2	1
Comments _____						

IV. Administrative Factors	In General	5	4	3	2	1
	For My School	5	4	3	2	1
Comments _____						

V. Parent/Community Relations Factors	In General	5	4	3	2	1
	For My School	5	4	3	2	1
Comments _____						

VI. Curriculum Factors	In General	5	4	3	2	1
	For My School	5	4	3	2	1
Comments _____						

VII. Teacher Orientation/Inservice Factors	In General	Extremely Feasible	Very Feasible	Feasible	Somewhat Unfeasible	Unfeasible
		5	4	3	2	1
	For My School	5	4	3	2	1

Comments_____

VIII. Educational Environment Factors	In General	5	4	3	2	1
	For My School	5	4	3	2	1

Comments_____

IX. Communication Factors	In General	5	4	3	2	1
	For My School	5	4	3	2	1

Comments_____

X. Student Orientation Factors	In General	5	4	3	2	1
	For My School	5	4	3	2	1

Comments_____

XI. Student Assessment Factors	In General	5	4	3	2	1
	For My School	5	4	3	2	1

Comments_____

APPENDIX F

RESPONSES TO SECTION TWO OF
QUESTIONNAIRES ONE AND TWO

Responses to Section Two of Questionnaires One and Two

1. The most important component for mainstreaming is the acceptance level of the regular classroom teacher. If she has a positive attitude most obstacles can be overcome. Communication between the special education teacher and the regular teacher is the pathway for that acceptance.
2. In addition to being "mainstreamed" special education students also need some individual or small group time to enable them to keep up emotionally and educationally; someone to help them interpret their world. This seems crucial to the implementation of mainstreaming.
3. In my years of dealing with the mainstreaming situation, I feel it is vital to have the child socialize and interact with his mainstreamed class outside of structured class activities so a positive feeling of acceptance and belonging is fostered.
4. Sufficient support personnel should be available for mainstreaming effectiveness. Frequent review of the mainstreamed student's adjustment and progress must be undertaken, especially in initial stages.
5. What is the "least restrictive environment?" What is

the role of the regional program and its administration?
When is it appropriate not to mainstream?

6. Expectations of the benefits of mainstreaming need to be realistic. "In-service" of parents is necessary but they are seldom available for this.
7. Very complete list - good luck to you!
8. Funding must be available to modify old facilities to accomodate the special needs of handicapped students.
9. Regular classroom teachers should be required to take some special education classes for their regular education certificate. More and more the responsibility will be on the regular education teachers' shoulders to accommodate the handicapped children - whether they're mainstreamed or in resource programs part of the day and the remainder in the classroom. An understanding of the law and techniques to work with these children is essential.
10. Released time is allowed for implementing, assessing, and attendance at annual reviews. Attention should be paid to the size of classes into which the student is to be mainstreamed. Coordinator of Special Education needs to consider how many classes are available at the proper grade level for the mainstreamed child. Schedules do not always permit subject-mainstreaming as ordered on an IEP.

11. Continual on-going articulation is necessary throughout the school year (Parent, child, and teacher).
12. Consensus between classroom teacher, special education teacher, administrator, and child on goals of program, dates of inception, and termination is important.
13. I feel very strongly that if we go through the process of placing children in special education, we should not mainstream a child until he/she is able to function in a classroom with minimal changes in the program. Regular class teachers get very upset when we talk about mainstreaming a child and then ask them to make major changes. Their attitude is "what is special ed. for?" In addition, the child becomes different because he is not doing what everyone else is - and all children are not as tolerant as we'd like them to be.
14. There are many hidden variables in each response!
Handicapped covers a lot of territory. What's extremely important for one type of handicapping condition is not as pressing a need for a different handicapping condition.
15. \$.
16. I don't find behavior modification programs important, but behavior management should be part of an inservice.

APPENDIX G

COMMENTS TO SECTIONS OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY

Comments to Sections of the Feasibility Study

Section I: Student Orientation Time

1. It would be feasible, but difficult, to fit into the curriculum.
2. Many teachers are unwilling to excuse students from class.[To participate in the orientation program.]
3. Our Child Study Team would be able to do this.

Section II: Teacher Orientation Time

1. Orientation would have to be outside the regular school day.
2. There should be some incentive for teachers to attend and participate in released time.
3. One orientation session is sufficient - 1 hour.
4. Too costly to implement in most school districts.
5. A little more difficult to accomplish but could be done.
6. With weekly staff meetings and frequent inservice committee meetings, many teachers are unwilling to give up more time.

Section III: Ancillary Personnel Factors

1. These people, in our district, have full schedules and it would be hard (but not impossible) to free up their time.
2. The specialists are all available to us.

3. Funding for the consultive services would have to be determined.
4. In addition to informal consultive services, a weekly multi-disciplinary staff conference is held.

Section IV: Administrative Factors

1. Matching of teachers and students by compatible teaching/learning styles is not feasible because special education placements are catagorical, not non-catagorical.
2. School administrators' duties are so varied that constant review of PL 94-142 and mainstreaming policies is necessary.
3. The factors are ideal.

Section V: Parent/Community Relations Factors

1. I feel our special education cooperative does a great deal to educate parents. They do not take advantage of the programs.
2. Parents of nonhandicapped students are probably not that interested in PL 94-142.
3. Parents can be informed only as they are willing to be informed.

Section VI: Curriculum Factors

1. Many teachers do modify the curriculum for special education students.

2. Your two curriculum factors are correct.
3. Many teachers feel that if a student is mainstreamed he should be responsible for the curriculum.

Section VII: Teacher Orientation/Inservice Factors

1. It is difficult for classroom teachers to find time to observe students before mainstreaming.
2. Regular teachers' observation of special education students in class would be difficult.

Section VIII: Educational Environment Factors

1. Class size precludes regular teachers from modifying instructional materials and teaching methods. A school is academic in orientation, so it is difficult to develop non-academic talents.
2. The regular classroom teacher must have the right attitude.
3. I feel these are extremely important.

Section IX: Communication Factors

1. In addition to frequent phone contact, monthly meetings are held with parents, regular teachers, and special educators.
2. This seems to be the case in our district.

Section X: Student Orientation Factors

1. We really do try to orient both special and regular education students before mainstreaming.

Section XI: Student Assessment Factors

1. The reporting system I use is very specific to educational goals which have been developed for each individual student. Those take a great deal of time to write and prepare.

APPENDIX H

SUMMARY OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
QUESTIONNAIRE ONE

APPENDIX H
QUESTIONNAIRE #1

ITEM #	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	ITEM #	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
1	4.2	0.83	28	3.6	1.16
2	4.3	0.75	29	2.9	1.20
3	4.6	0.75	30	4.2	0.69
4	4.4	0.80	31	4.4	0.89
5	3.0	1.10	32	4.1	0.80
6	4.5	0.77	33	3.7	1.02
7	4.3	0.87	34	3.7	1.05
8	3.2	0.95	35	3.7	0.93
9	3.8	0.77	36	4.1	1.14
10	4.2	0.92	37	3.5	1.28
11	4.1	0.84	38	4.1	0.88
12	4.1	0.80	39	3.9	1.06
13	4.3	0.95	40	3.9	1.10
14	4.0	1.18	41	3.5	1.22
15	3.2	1.28	42	3.3	0.83
16	3.5	1.13	43	3.9	0.85
17	3.6	1.28	44	2.8	1.30
18	4.6	0.45	45	3.3	0.92
19	2.3	1.00	46	4.0	0.76
20	2.1	1.05	47	3.2	1.29
21	3.8	1.12	48	2.6	1.11
22	3.9	0.82	49	4.1	0.80
23	3.9	1.28	50	4.2	0.65
24	3.9	1.07	51	3.9	1.10
25	4.6	0.79	52	4.4	0.94
26	4.0	1.01	53	3.9	0.89
27	2.6	1.19			

APPENDIX I

SUMMARY OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
QUESTIONNAIRE TWO

APPENDIX I
QUESTIONNAIRE #2

ITEM #	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	ITEM #	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
1	4.0	0.92	28	4.0	0.96
2	4.1	0.98	29	4.0	0.96
3	4.4	0.75	30	3.7	1.05
4	4.4	0.62	31	3.4	0.63
5	2.4	1.10	32	4.3	0.84
6	4.5	0.75	33	3.4	0.98
7	4.6	0.63	34	3.8	1.02
8	2.9	1.14	35	4.0	0.87
9	3.8	0.88	36	4.2	0.73
10	3.9	1.20	37	3.5	1.06
11	4.2	1.00	38	3.4	0.84
12	4.3	0.82	39	4.0	0.82
13	4.2	1.06	40	3.7	0.87
14	4.0	0.92	41	3.9	1.20
15	3.2	1.42	42	3.3	1.11
16	3.2	0.83	43	3.8	0.69
17	3.7	0.82	44	3.9	0.82
18	4.7	0.60	45	3.7	0.84
19	4.3	0.73	46	3.8	0.99
20	3.8	0.78	47	3.7	0.66
21	3.9	0.95			
22	4.1	0.87			
23	4.6	0.69			
24	4.0	0.92			
25	3.6	0.84			
26	4.2	0.75			
27	4.5	0.70			

APPENDIX J

SUMMARY OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
FEASIBILITY STUDY

APPENDIX J
FEASIBILITY STUDY

IN GENERAL			FOR MY SCHOOL		
ITEM #	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	ITEM #	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
1	2.8	0.89	1	2.6	1.07
2	2.9	0.83	2	2.4	0.89
3	3.8	0.91	3	3.8	1.01
4	4.1	0.86	4	3.7	1.06
5	3.3	0.96	5	2.9	0.83
6	4.2	0.74	6	3.9	1.12
7	3.6	0.82	7	3.2	0.46
8	3.6	0.93	8	3.6	1.02
9	4.3	0.57	9	4.2	0.74
10	4.0	0.74	10	3.6	0.82
11	4.1	0.86	11	3.8	1.01

VITA

NORBERT T. BUNISH was born in Chicago, Illinois on June 26, 1931. He graduated from Falconer Elementary School and Taft High School in Chicago.

Following high school graduation, he was employed by International Harvester Company. He served two years in the United States Marine Corps and was honorably released from active duty in 1954. After his release from active military duty, he entered The University of Illinois, Navy Pier Branch. After completion of the two year program, he transferred to Chicago Teachers College. He was awarded the Bachelor of Education degree in January, 1958. He received a Master of Education degree in administration and supervision from Loyola University in January, 1961. He did additional graduate work at Chicago Teachers College, Loyola, and DePaul Universities.

In July, 1960 he was married to the former Mary Jo Valentino to whom one child, Lisa Marie, was born in 1968.

In 1958 he began teaching at the Knickerbocker School in Chicago. He transferred to Oscar F. Mayer Elementary School in September, 1959 and is presently employed there as a counselor, a position he has held for the last 11 years.